THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXC.] OCTOBER, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS—THE BROAD CHURCH.*

It is amusing to one who sits calmly enjoying free thought and its rich and varied consequences on the outside of the popular religious communities, to see how every now and then those communities are thrown into alarm and confusion by the appearance of some truth-loving preacher or some free-speaking book. The disturbance resembles a storm suddenly raised on the Lake of Galilee by conflicting winds hurled down one of its narrow and precipitous ravines. An effect of the kind has been produced by the volume we now design to introduce to our readers. The orthodox periodical press has teemed with reprobatory reviews. Cries of "Heresy! heresy!" echo and re-echo on all sides. Criticism is blinded by passion, and the traditions of the schools have it all their own way. The general voice is, that this is a bad book, a dangerous book; yet somehow the book is read. Perhaps the book is read because it is abused; perhaps it is read also because some portion of the public mind is prepared for the book. Any way, the book came to a second edition shortly after it appeared, and so is worthy of a somewhat special notice, if only as disclosing one of the signs of the times. Certainly the book is anything but orthodox, and its reception goes some way to shew that as orthodoxy is not alone in authority at Oxford, the birthplace of the volume, so is it somewhat at a discount and not a little afraid, at least in literary and cultured circles of our larger religious bodies. Indeed, the work is a decisive proof of the progress made by free thought, sound scholarship and liberal opinion, in matters theological. So far as the intellectual tendencies of the volume are concerned, we can, with one or two exceptions, rejoice at its appearance. Would that we could say the same as to its moral aspects! The writers are men of high culture and exact scholarship. Having themselves shared in the rich harvest of religious thought produced and garnered by the great scholars and theologians of Germany, they come forward to communicate their advantages to the churches in which the English language is spoken. Especially do they address themselves to the more cultivated members of those churches. The

* Essays and Reviews. Second Edition. London—John W. Parker and Son, West Strand.

topics on which they write, lying as they do at the foundations of theological science, ask for an intelligent and to some extent a specially prepared auditory. While, however, the topics are abstract, profound and grave, they are here treated in a popular and interesting manner, so as to make the subject-matter accessible to every thoughtful person, and to offer a plentiful reward to the careful student. The contents comprise seven essays, thrown together into a volume apparently at random, yet by no means without a unity of effect; for they all bear on questions of great moment, questions on which advancing knowledge has occasioned great changes, if not revolutions, and to which the minds of many of the leaders of theological opinion have their eyes turned with no small interest, if not concern. The first essay, by Dr. Temple, Head Master of Rugby School, treats of "The Education of the World," endeavouring to trace an analogy between the successive steps of Divine Providence in the religious discipline of the human family and the successive ages through which individuals of that family pass in their journey from the cradle to the grave. In the second essay, entitled "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," Dr. Rowland Williams, Vice-Principal of the Episcopal College at Lampeter, in Wales, undertakes to give a summary of the conclusions to which Chevalier Bunsen has arrived in his learned, laborious and very diversified studies relating to biblical chronology, history, antiquities, &c. A passage in this instructive piece so well illustrates the predominating spirit, and what we may perhaps denominate the aim, of this book, that we extract it, though rather long.

"This recognition of Christ as the moral Saviour of mankind may seem to some Baron Bunsen's most obvious claim to the name of Christian. For, though he embraces with more than orthodox warmth New Testament terms, he explains them in such a way, that he may be charged with using Evangelical language in a philosophical sense. But in reply he would ask, what proof is there that the reasonable sense of St. Paul's words was not the one which the Apostle intended? Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? St. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility, as opposed to sacerdotalism; or that to obey is better than sacrifice. Faith would be opposed, not to the good deeds which conscience requires, but to works of appeasement by ritual. Justification would be neither an arbitrary ground of confidence, nor a reward upon condition of our disclaiming merit, but rather a verdict of forgiveness upon our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts. It is not a fatal objection, to say that St. Paul would thus teach Natural Religion, unless we were sure that he was bound to contradict it; but it is a confirmation of the view, if it brings his hard sayings into harmony with the Gospels and with the Psalms, as well as with the instincts of our best conscience. If we had dreamed of our nearest kindred in irreconcilable combat, and felt anguish at the thought of opposing either,

it could be no greater relief to awake, and find them at concord, than it would be to some minds to find the antagonism between Nature and Revelation vanishing in a wider grasp and deeper perception of the one, or in a better balanced statement of the other.

"If our philosopher had persuaded us of the moral nature of Justification, he would not shrink from adding that Regeneration is a correspondent giving of insight, or an awakening of forces of the soul. By Resurrection he would mean a spiritual quickening. Salvation would be our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness, which are His finite opposites (ὁ ἀντικείμενος). Propitiation would be the recovery of that peace, which cannot be while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts. The eternal is what belongs to God, as spirit, therefore the negation of things finite and unspiritual, whether world, or letter, or rite of blood. The hateful fires of the vale of Hinnom (Gehenna) are hardly in the strict letter imitated by the God who has pronounced them cursed, but may serve as images of distracted remorse. Heaven is not a place, so much as fulfilment of the love of God. The kingdom of God is no more Romish sacerdotalism than Jewish royalty, but the realization of the Divine Will in our thoughts and lives. This expression of spirit, in deed and form, is generically akin to creation, and illustrates the incarnation. For though the true substance of Deity took body in the Son of Man, they who know the Divine Substance to be Spirit, will conceive of such embodiment of the Eternal Mind very differently from those who abstract all Divine attributes, such as consciousness, forethought, and love, and then imagine a material *residuum*, on which they confer the Holiest name. The Divine attributes are consubstantial with the Divine essence. He who abides in love, abides in God, and God in him. Thus the incarnation becomes with our author as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul. The son of David by birth is the Son of God by the spirit of holiness. What is flesh, is born of flesh, and what is spirit, is born of spirit.

"If we would estimate the truth of such views, the full import of which hardly lies on the surface, we find two lines of inquiry present themselves as criteria: and each of these divides itself into two branches. First, as regards the subject matter, both spiritual affection and metaphysical reasoning forbid us to confine revelations like those of Christ to the first half century of our era, but show at least affinities of our faith existing in men's minds, anterior to Christianity, and renewed with deep echo from living hearts in many a generation. Again, on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustration in outward act of principles perpetually true; but not adequate to guarantee narratives inherently incredible, or precepts evidently wrong. Hence we are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony. Thus, as we are expressly told, we are to have the witness in ourselves. It is not our part to dictate to Almighty God, that He ought to have spared us this strain upon our consciences; nor in giving us through His Son a deeper revelation of His own presence, was He bound to accompany His gift by a special form of record. Hence there is no antecedent necessity that the least rational view of

the gospel should be the truest, or that our faith should have no human element, and its records be exempt from historical law. Rather we may argue, the more Divine the germ, the more human must be the development."—Pp. 80—83.

The third essay comes from the pen of Mr. Baden Powell. His writings hold no high position among our favourites, though we gladly admit that he did good service in quarters where truth from minds superior to his own could not have obtained an audience because living and working beyond the circle of recognized orthodoxy. The service, however, which he did lay in breaking asunder the incrustations of error rather than in communicating positive and quickening truth. His mind was too materialistic to represent truly and espouse effectually the great spiritual verities of the gospel. The present contribution to "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity" justifies the statement. What its author terms "physical causation" enchains his own mind, as, in his view, it enchains the universe. With him, God is the great mechanician, who having formed the world and established its laws, is held in bondage to the work of his own hands. Accordingly God retires from the activities of the universe, all of which are carried on by physical laws which are supreme and invariable—"the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature" (p. 134). To a mind imbued with such views, miracles are simple impossibilities; for "they bear on purely physical contemplations" (p. 133), and so become palpable physical contradictions. In reading the sentences in which these doctrines are enunciated, we have for a moment imagined ourselves deep in the pages of the "Système de la Nature." Not more emphatically does the Baron d'Holbach assert the sovereignty of what he calls "Nature" against the Author and Sustainer of the universe, than does Mr. Powell assert the iron rule of "physical causes." In both cases, the theory is atheistic. God is expelled from the temple he has built, or cast, bound in adamantine chains, into some dungeon sunk beneath its foundations. A God of whom this may be said is no God. The true God fills, governs and guides the world He made at first and ever renews. "Physical causes" is an unmeaning phrase. All causes are moral or mental. Intelligence is supreme. To be supreme, intelligence must be free. Freedom is involved in intelligence, even as impenetrability is a quality of matter. Intelligence is powerful because it is free, and the Infinite Intelligence possesses unqualified freedom and boundless power. Hence God is at once the Sovereign and the Creator of all things,—the one sole, proper Cause, whose thought is existence, whose will is law, and whose law is phenomenal being, with all its qualities, movements and issues. The universe, then, is simply God's uttered thought. That thought

uttered according to his good pleasure, the same good pleasure now makes permanent, giving rise to order and beauty,—now modifies and varies, giving rise to exceptional men, as Homer, Socrates, Shakspeare, Milton,—or to exceptional phenomena, as the signs shewn by Jesus of the divine presence by which he was attended, and of which his life itself was the greatest and most convincing. That order and these exceptions are not arbitrary, but designed to fulfil the purposes of Infinite Goodness by contributing, each after its kind, and each with effect alike needful and powerful, to the education of the human species—the grand end of the divine government as seen here on the earth. The miracles of Jesus then enter into the general plan and form part of the general harmony of the moral government of the world, in promoting which "physical causes" have at once their reason and their justification.

We have put forth these views because we are convinced that hostility to the miracles of the gospel rises or falls with the conception entertained of God. Miracles are biblical facts, and to be rightly appreciated and judged must be contemplated under the light in which the Bible places its Divine Author. There all things are of God, who is at once in, through and over all. As such, God's word is as free and powerful to produce the Christ with all his prerogatives and signs, as he is to command light to be, and to distribute light among the choirs of heaven. So enamoured is Mr. Powell of his physical theory of the universe, that he even denies to God, or at least to our apprehensions of God, a liberty of action which he concedes to men.

"The most seemingly improbable events in *human* history may be perfectly credible, on sufficient testimony, however contradicting ordinary experience of human motives and conduct—simply because we cannot assign any limits to the varieties of human dispositions, passions, or tendencies, or the extent to which they may be influenced by circumstances of which, perhaps, we have little or no knowledge to guide us. But no such cases would have the remotest applicability to alleged violations of the laws of *matter*, or interruptions of the course of *physical* causes."—P. 132.

Testimony then may, it seems, be received in some cases as a sufficient voucher of events contradicting ordinary experience. If this is true of human agency, why not of divine? Why is it admitted of the former? Because to us the latitude of human action is unbounded. What, then, is the Infinite Mind less unbounded than the finite? You shrink from declaring an act of the creature impossible because he may possess resources of which you are not aware; but God's mode and extent of action you have no scruple to determine and define, and any way are very sure He did not, because He could not, still a storm on the Lake of Galilee, though He does still storms there even now constantly; nor open the eyes of the blind, nor unstop the deaf

ear, though in the same breath you declare Him the creator of both eye and ear, and the bestower of all their functions and gratifications. No! God may give, He may take away, but restore He cannot, except He employ the physician's skill—which very skill is not so much the physician's as God's!

We must declare that Mr. Baden Powell's science looks not a little like the "science falsely so called" rebuked by the apostle Paul: it is equally narrow and pretentious. The chief source of our author's hallucination arises from his persisting to judge a religious fact by what he terms a "physical law." The miracles recorded in the New Testament are to be regarded not in the abstract, but as forming a part of a religion whose ground-thoughts are these—God is the Author of all things; God is the Father of the human family; God governs the universe with a view to the education of the members of that family; among the schoolmasters God raised up and appointed to their work was Jesus of Nazareth, who was called God's Son because he was so like God; that Son, as being like God, possessed God's spirit, and so wielded God's power; this he did in union and co-operation with God, and with an express and avowed view to the highest good of man; that good was best secured, first by the human and superhuman life of the Son of God, and secondly by the wonderful works which he performed, all stamped with God's own image, and so all fitted to promote God's great work. In consequence of this multiform yet harmonious system of divine manifestations, the world was "translated out of darkness into marvellous light," and has ever since been advancing in all that makes man free, great and happy. The operation will proceed, until the spirit of Christ becomes the spirit of man, and the spirit of man is filled with immortal blessedness in union with the spirit of God. This is an outline of the system in connection with which the miracles of Jesus are found to stand. As a part of that system are they to be contemplated and judged. If they prove to be in harmony with that system, you can disallow and destroy them only by disallowing and destroying the system itself. The miracles stand or fall with the gospel; and the gospel, as the word of God, is imperishable.

If the miracles of the New Testament are thus indissolubly linked with its religion, then it seems a strange thing that an avowed and recognized minister of that religion should be engaged in an attempt to upset the miracles. The author of this essay has ere this appeared before the Judge of all the earth, and in consequence our words shall be measured; but inasmuch as he has left his thoughts to work for either evil or good as may be, those words must be honest. And we confess that we partly blame and partly pity one who enjoyed the honours and ate the bread of a religious Establishment whose fundamental principles he studiously laboured to undermine. We could indeed find

reason to honour that Establishment in the latitude with which she allows her sons to speak, as illustrated in this essay especially, did we not fear that instead of proceeding from an enlightened and conscientious love of Christian liberty, it proceeds from indifference and disregard. Opinions of all sorts are tolerated by and in the Church of England so long as the Church itself is left to enjoy the honours and emoluments of its connection with the State. With impunity you may assail the miracles, but it will go hard with you if you assail episcopacy. You may even put forth materialistic representations of God's relation to the universe, but you must not call in question the apostolicity of baronial archbishops and opulent deans. Of course we would rather have the actual toleration than an active bigotry. Yet we cannot forget that a toleration which is accompanied by such anathemas as are used to fence round the Athanasian Creed, is self-condemned and dishonest, and as such must, as indeed it does, work in favour of an extreme latitudinarianism which declares all opinions of equal value, and so declares that truth is a mere fancy. Not without pain, therefore, do we look on the volume that lies before us. Intended to bear testimony to certain convictions, in which convictions there is much we believe to be true, it witnesses from first to last to the immoral tendency and operation of the Established Church, as professing one thing in her formularies and articles of union, and teaching another thing by the pens of acknowledged representatives. Here the contrariety is too obvious and too broad to be denied. The Church of England, in her most liberal mood, professes to be founded on holy Scripture. Holy Scripture contains narratives of miraculous deeds. Hence consistency requires that the Church of England and those narratives should be one. In fact, they are sundered by some of its clergy. What is this but to disown the Bible as well as the miracles—in other words, to cut away the foundations of the religion for whose support and exposition the Establishment exists in so much dignity and wealth? Such freedom is spurious, such toleration is rotten, and such a ministration of Christianity is antichristian.

The principal blame of this inconsistency lies against the Church itself. The parent vice is to be found in the connection of that Church with the State. State-Churches have in all ages and all countries exhibited a similarly lamentable spectacle whenever the advance of thought left them in its rear. A religious Establishment without a creed is an impossibility; and as creeds are nothing but formulas of human opinion, and as human opinions change as time and circumstance change, so is a divarication between Establishments and their creeds inevitable in the ceaseless progressions of society. Hence State-Churches are in their principle antichristian. Equally are they snares to conscience. Thorough honesty in connection with them seems to us impos-

sible. And yet honesty is the very soul of religion. And the question of "Honest or not?" is a question for every individual, and not merely for the communities and associations with which individuals may be connected. Accordingly there is no salve for my conscience if I think to throw the blame of my inconsistency on my church. If my church allows a lie, that is a very good reason for quitting my church, but no reason at all for my being a *particeps criminis*. And here we cannot keep back our judgment that the blame of inconsistency, as exemplified in this volume, does not lie wholly or exclusively on the Church. In part at least it lies on the authors of these essays; and they are the more open to the blame because they are not ordinary men, because they obviously possess moral light, and because they put themselves forward as reformers of the age. It is not an exculpation to plead their courage in thus avowing obnoxious truths. We admit and we commend that courage, and our commendation would be unrestricted and hearty were the courage less faltering and more thorough. As it is, the essayists seem to us to be in the position of men who will tell all the truth they can tell with due regard to the safety of their professional position. Such a proceeding lacks the principle of honesty, and so is very much out of place in ministers of a religion which in regard to conscience will have all or none.

The fourth essay is devoted by its author, the Rev. H. B. Wilson, B.D., Vicar of Great Stoughton, Hunts, to a defence of the principle of a National Church in general, and of the English Established Church in particular. Treating the subject under the two abstractions of multitudinism or nationalism, representing the establishment of religion, on the one side,—and, on the other, of individualism, representing Dissent or Nonconformity, the writer gives a decided preference to the former,—writing, however, in a liberal tone. We have already shewn what opinion we entertain on this point, and do not intend to re-open the subject. We have only two remarks to offer. We think that in describing Nonconformity as individualism, Mr. Wilson has secured a verdict against himself; for individualism is the spirit of Christianity, the first aim of which in regard to man is to mould individuals, as such, into the likeness of Christ, and so to make a perfect church out of an infinite number of Christ-like individuals. Alike condemnatory of his views is the following short passage; for the English Church does require "of many men a unanimity in speculative doctrine which is unattainable, and a uniformity of historical belief which can never exist." We quote these words the rather because they seem to involve on the part of their writer an uneasy moral consciousness, a wish to testify against the moral infelicity of his own position.

"Jesus Christ has not revealed His religion as a theology of the intellect, nor as an historical faith; and it is a stifling of the true Christian

life, both in the individual and in the Church, to require of many men a unanimity in speculative doctrine, which is unattainable, and a uniformity of historical belief, which can never exist. The true Christian life is the consciousness of bearing a part in a great moral order, of which the highest agency upon earth has been committed to the Church. Let us not oppress this work nor complicate the difficulties with which it is surrounded; 'not making the heart of the righteous sad, whom the Lord hath not made sad, nor strengthening the hands of the wicked by promising him life.'

"There is enough indeed to sadden us in the doubtful warfare which the good wages with the evil, both within us and without us. How few, under the most favourable conditions, learn to bring themselves face to face with the great moral law, which is the manifestation of the Will of God! The greater part can only detect the evil when it comes forth from them, nearly as when any other might observe it. We cannot, in the matter of those who are brought under the highest influences of the Christian Church, any more than in the case of mankind viewed in their ordinary relations, give any account of the apparently useless expenditure of power—of the apparent overbearing generally of the higher law by the lower—of the apparent poverty of result from the operation of a wonderful machinery—of the seeming waste of myriads of germs, for the sake of a few mature growths."—Pp. 204, 205.

Of the fifth essay, "On the Mosaic Cosmogony, by C. W. Goodwin, M.A.," we shall merely remark that it handles with less felicity and success than might have been expected a subject of great importance, and on which the mind of English and American churches has been more moved than on most of the other subjects brought into view by this "Broad Church" manifesto.

The sixth essay, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750," seems somewhat out of place. It is, indeed, full of instruction, but has no very obvious bearing on the general tenor of the volume. It is a less serious objection to say that, though instructive, it is somewhat dry and unattractive.

We have hastened onwards thus because we wished to delay a little on the last essay, which is the gem of the volume, "On the Interpretation of Scripture, by Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford." In some of the preceding pages we have met with a degree of caution, a halting apparently before a bolder and more valuable truth than that just uttered, a dim consciousness of keeping back a part of the price. Here there is a full and unrestricted outspokenness. The writer utters what is in his mind without restraint. His treatment also covers the whole subject. It is a volume within the limits of an essay. At least most of the principal points relating to the science of sacred exegesis find some notice in these admirable pages. With slight exceptions, the style is as good as the matter. It may indeed be declared that the learned author has written on a scholar's subject in a way to

suit any ordinarily cultivated person. We state the fact because we are desirous to win the attention of young persons, nor least young women, to this instructive and interesting composition. We plead guilty to a special reason; the essay embodies an undesigned but effectual justification of Unitarianism. Here are the principles of interpretation which are taught to our divinity students while at college; here are the principles of interpretation which underlie the teachings given by our ministers from the pulpit; and here are even results of the same principles of interpretation as set forth in our Unitarian manuals and embodied in our Unitarian sermons. Here they are, those principles and those results, we do not say derived from Unitarian sources, but certainly wonderfully corroborative of our Unitarian position. If these instructions are the independent products of Professor Jowett's own reading and thinking, they are an independent evidence to the general truth of Unitarian Christianity. If they come out of the spirit of free inquiry in its application to the most advanced and clearly-ascertained scholarship of the age, they are not only an independent but a very strong evidence to the general truth of Unitarian Christianity. Believing that the suppositions we have put are to a great extent simple facts, we hail a fellow-believer in a fellow-inquirer, and thank him for the testimony undesignedly given by him to a view of the gospel of Christ which has long been dear to us, and which becomes increasingly dear to us with the increase of our knowledge, experience and years.

One of our own writers, a man of no mean ability though fond of paradox, has described the Unitarian interpretation of scripture as of but secondary merit. Did we hold such an opinion, we should openly renounce Unitarian views; for there could be no doubt in our mind that if our method of dealing with scripture was inferior, a superior cast of thought could not be educed thereby. That a wrong road should lead to a right end is wholly improbable. The allegation finds an answer in Mr. Jowett's essay, which will be recognized by the students in our Colleges as in substance the same as that by which their scriptural studies were and are directed. One passage, however, in this essay, giving an outline of the history of interpretation, affords us an opportunity for putting side by side the greater interpreters of the church, divided into the two classes of men of resistance and men of progress. These are the words:

"It" (a "History of the Interpretation of Scripture") "would mark the different epochs of interpretation from the time when the living word was in the process of becoming a book to Origen and Tertullian, from Origen to Jerome and Augustine, from Jerome and Augustine to Abelard and Aquinas; again making a new beginning with the revival of literature, from Erasmus, the father of biblical criticism in more recent times,

with Calvin and Beza for his immediate successors, through Grotius and Hammond, down to De Wette and Meier, our own contemporaries."—P. 339.

Men of resistance.	*Men of progress.*
1. Tertullian (hardly).	1. Origen.
2. Jerome.	2. Abelard.
3. Augustine.	3. Erasmus.
4. Aquinas.	4. Beza.
5. Calvin (hardly).	5. Grotius.
6. Meier (hardly).	6. Hammond.
	7. De Wette.

The majority is on the side of progress. But in the minority are names that have some claim to be transferred to the other side. Tertullian was free in his inquiries and did not end in orthodoxy, if the Athanasian Creed is to be taken as the standard. Calvin dealt freely with the scholastic notions of the Trinity, in consequence of penetrating into the spirit of the New Testament writings. Meier would not pass muster before a board of ordinary English Episcopal or Independent doctors. Passing to the majority, we remark that Origen, the father of the science of biblical interpretation, was a Unitarian, expressly forbidding prayer to Christ. A Unitarian also was Abelard. Erasmus appears to have held Arian views, and so was a Unitarian. Grotius, who in his own day was not without reason accused of Socinianism, drew largely from the exegetical treasures of the Socinian church, the true founder of biblical exegesis since the revival of letters; for what Grotius took from them, in both method and matter, passed especially through Arminius, Episcopius and others of the same liberal school of theological thought, into the great currents of scriptural information, and appeared in full measure in Hammond, whence it has been widely and generally diffused. The processes and the treasures of even the recent German school of interpreters, of which De Wette and Meier may be accounted the head, and who, not having been yet surpassed, may be considered as having uttered the last word in the long series of investigations into the meaning of the New Testament, are in the main indebted for their value to the principles and practice of these men of progress, who have been the lights of the church and will ever remain its glory. Moreover, these men of progress are all animated by the spirit of continual growth which characterizes Unitarians; the majority of them held and maintained opinions not dissimilar to our own; and De Wette, the prince of critics, scarcely ever fails to decide on the Unitarian side in the passages whose meaning is matter of dispute between them and Unitarian authorities. The words cited from Professor Jowett limit the range of our observations, else we should put in a claim for high position on behalf of John Locke, Dr. John Taylor, Dr. Lardner and Dr. Priestley, not to mention names of inferior note, yet

highly respectable. In one thing all these great men agreed—they sought truth in the love of it, assured that the more they inquired with truth-loving minds, the more fully would God make known to them his holy will; while the men of resistance aimed mainly to preserve the traditions of the past, and with that view to withstand innovations. In the spirit of the former class is the volume of Essays and Reviews conceived and executed. A similar mission to theirs it is sent out to fulfil (would that its moral spirit were equally high, pure and heroic!), and on that account we bid it God-speed, and should do so heartily were its positive teachings less in accordance with our own views than they are.

In the development of his views, Mr. Jowett has occasion to state a number of principles to be observed and practised on the part of the biblical interpreter. We had made some preparations fitted to shew that these principles are found uttered in Unitarian authors of acknowledged authority. Going back into the Transylvanian church of the seventeenth century, we find in their *Summa Universæ Theologiæ* principles of the same import and bearing, while these may be traced back into the many exegetical pieces which enrich the series of bulky tomes forming the collection of folios called the Library of the Fratres Socini. We must not, however, attempt a volume when professing only to write a review. Yet, if only to shew that we speak not without a good foundation, we transcribe some passages from this essay which differ little, if at all, from the views we ourselves entertain, and in which the intelligent and well-instructed Unitarian reader will recognize opinions having at least a general agreement with his own:

The proper source of our knowledge of what Inspiration is.

"The nature of inspiration can only be known from the examination of Scripture. There is no other source to which we can turn for information; and we have no right to assume some imaginary doctrine of inspiration like the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church. To the question, 'What is inspiration?' the first answer therefore is, 'That idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it.' It is no mere *a-priori* notion, but one to which the book is itself a witness. It is a fact which we infer from the study of Scripture—not of one portion only, but of the whole. Obviously then it embraces writings of very different kinds—the book of Esther, for example, or the Song of Solomon, as well as the Gospel of St. John. It is reconcileable with the mixed good and evil of the characters of the Old Testament, which nevertheless does not exclude them from the favour of God, with the attribution to the Divine Being of actions at variance with that higher revelation, which he has given of himself in the Gospel; it is not inconsistent with imperfect or opposite aspects of the truth as in the book of Job or Ecclesiastes, with variations of fact in the Gospels or the books of Kings and Chronicles, with inaccuracies of language in the Epistles of St. Paul. For these are all found in Scripture; neither is there any reason why

they should not be, except a general impression that Scripture ought to have been written in a way different from what it has. A principle of progressive revelation admits them all; and this is already contained in the words of our Saviour, 'Moses because of the hardness of your hearts;' or even in the Old Testament, 'Henceforth there shall be no more this proverb in the house of Israel.' For what is progressive is necessarily imperfect in its earlier stages, and even erring to those who come after, whether it be the maxims of a half-civilized world which are compared with those of a civilized one, or the law with the Gospel. Scripture itself points the way to answer the moral objections to Scripture. Lesser difficulties remain, but only such as would be found commonly in writings of the same age or country. There is no more reason why imperfect narratives should be excluded from Scripture than imperfect grammar; no more ground for expecting that the New Testament would be logical or Aristotelian in form, than that it would be written in Attic Greek."—Pp. 347, 348.

Scripture forcibly misapplied.

"The temper of accommodation shows itself especially in two ways: first, in the attempt to adapt the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the creeds; secondly, in the adaptation of the precepts and maxims of Scripture to the language or practice of our own age. Now the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity; they stand in a close relation to the words of Christ and his Apostles; nor can it be said that any heterodox formula makes a nearer approach to a simple and scriptural rule of faith. Neither is anything gained by contrasting them with Scripture, in which the germs of the expressions used in them are sufficiently apparent. Yet it does not follow that they should be pressed into the service of the interpreter. The growth of ideas in the interval which separated the first century from the fourth or sixth makes it impossible to apply the language of the one to the explanation of the other. Between Scripture and the Nicene or Athanasian Creed, a world of the understanding comes in—that world of abstractions and second notions; and mankind are no longer at the same point as when the whole of Christianity was contained in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou mayest be saved,' when the Gospel centred in the attachment to a living or recently departed friend and Lord. The language of the New Testament is the first utterance and consciousness of the mind of Christ; or the immediate vision of the Word of life (1 John i. 1) as it presented itself before the eyes of his first followers, or as the sense of his truth and power grew upon them (Romans i. 3, 4); the other is the result of three or four centuries of reflection and controversy. And although this last had a truth suited to its age, and its technical expressions have sunk deep into the heart of the human race, it is not the less unfitted to be the medium by the help of which Scripture is to be explained. If the occurrence of the phraseology of the Nicene age in a verse of the Epistles would detect the spuriousness of the verse in which it was found, how can the Nicene or Athanasian Creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture? That advantage which the New Testament has over the teaching of the Church, as representing what may be termed the childhood of the Gospel, would be lost if its language were required to conform to that of the Creeds."—Pp. 353, 354.

Proving a doctrine from Scripture.

"Nor indeed is it easy to say what is the meaning of 'proving a doctrine from Scripture.' For when we demand logical equivalents and similarity of circumstances, when we balance adverse statements, St. James and St. Paul, the New Testament with the Old, it will be hard to demonstrate from Scripture any complex system either of doctrine or practice. The Bible is not a book of statutes in which words have been chosen to cover the multitude of cases, but in the greater portion of it, especially the Gospels and Epistles, 'like a man talking to his friend.' Nay, more, it is a book written in the East, which is in some degree liable to be misunderstood, because it speaks the language and has the feeling of Eastern lands. Nor can we readily determine in explaining the words of our Lord or of St. Paul, how much (even of some of the passages just quoted) is to be attributed to Oriental modes of speech. Expressions which would be regarded as rhetorical exaggerations in the Western world are the natural vehicles of thought to an Eastern people. How great then must be the confusion where an attempt is made to draw out these Oriental modes with the severity of a philosophical or legal argument! Is it not such a use of the words of Christ which he himself rebukes when he says, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' (John vi. 52, 63.)"—Pp. 366, 367.

The essayist has well summed up the laws of interpretation he lays down in these valuable words:

"Of what has been said, this is the sum:—'That Scripture, like other books, has one meaning, which is to be gathered from itself without reference to the adaptations of Fathers or Divines; and without regard to *a-priori* notions about its nature and origin. It is to be interpreted like other books, with attention to the character of its authors, and the prevailing state of civilization and knowledge, with allowance for peculiarities of style and language, and modes of thought and figures of speech. Yet not without a sense that as we read there grows upon us the witness of God in the world, anticipating in a rude and primitive age the truth that was to be, shining more and more unto the perfect day in the life of Christ, which again is reflected from different points of view in the teaching of His Apostles.'"—P. 404.

Were we, however, to lay before the reader all that is true and useful in this most excellent essay, we should have to transcribe the bulk of it. We conclude with two additional remarks. From several positions here laid down we are compelled to dissent. The writer, for instance, seems to us to undervalue the Old-Testament Scriptures as an aid to the interpretation of the New-Testament Scriptures. The former, in our judgment, is the key to the latter. After making every allowance for the modifying influence of Greek thought through the Alexandrine school of theological and philosophical speculation, we find in the older Scriptures the root of that religious development of which the fruit is given in the Gospels and the Epistles. Our second remark regards a misrepresentation into which so well-informed a scholar and so liberal a writer ought not to have fallen. On p. 355, Unitarians are represented as holding Christ

to be "a mere man." The representation is incorrect. We have never known a Unitarian who held Christ to be "a mere man." No one can be a Unitarian who holds Christ to be "a mere man;" for a Unitarian is one who receives Christ as God's messenger and representative to a sinful world. Divinity in some way is ascribed to Christ by every Unitarian who knows the reason of the hope that is in him. Find the element in inspiration; in God's constant presence; in divine knowledge and power communicated to Jesus; in his official appointment, preparation and dignity; in his divinely-constituted relations to his age and to mankind; in his pure and lofty wisdom and his holy and God-devoted life; in his being the word of God uttered in what Jesus was, did, said and suffered; in the honours bestowed upon him by the gift of the spirit of God without measure, by his transfiguration, his resurrection, his ascension, his constant supervision of his church, and his final triumph in the universal prevalence of the gospel;—find it in any or in all of these forms and representations (and doubtless various are the views under which Christ's glory is set forth in Scripture), you will, on going a little below the surface, discover that they have a point of agreement and a common unity in the acknowledgment of a divine element as differencing Jesus from other men; and in that divine element Unitarians, no less than other disciples of Christ, find their bond of union one with another, and their ground of trust in the one Head of the church, the one Teacher, Lord and Saviour of the world. If we may venture to make a suggestion to one so qualified to instruct others, we would respectfully suggest to Professor Jowett that he should make himself acquainted with some of the best Unitarian writers before he again undertakes to characterize the Unitarian form of thought. J. R. B.

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.*

The first of these volumes has been published at the suggestion of the gentleman to whom it is inscribed. It consists of eight lectures, which the author delivered "some years since in the ordinary course of pulpit duty." We cordially concur in the judgment that they are "likely to be useful to a wider circle" than that which had already heard them. Learned, able and convincing, they are of a character, in regard to Christian feeling, calculated to fix the attention of all persons who simply desire

* Lectures on the Doctrine of Atonement. By J. Scott Porter. Pp. 166. London—Whitfield.

Six Lectures on the Scriptural Doctrine of Reconciliation, or Atonement, and connected Subjects. By Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A. Pp. 158. London—Whitfield.

to understand the truth. It is our duty to commend works of this nature to the study of our orthodox friends and connections. From the neglect of such a course, we lose many excellent opportunities of rendering service alike to them and to the cause of God.

Of the same high character are the six lectures of Mr. Carpenter, though they appear in a somewhat plain and unpretending form. They contain strictures on a publication by the Rev. Enoch Mellor, in which the Unitarian doctrines appear to have been unfairly treated. There is in these lectures much interesting dissertation apart from what may be considered as purely controversial, and the spirit in which the author writes is admirable, quite in keeping with the disposition manifested in the following passage from his Preface:

"Doctrines will never be truly discerned unless approached in their own spirit. We shall never understand how God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, till there is in us the spirit of Christ reconciling us to each other. Controversy seems unfavourable to reconciliation: I fear that the present one has stimulated some displays of bigotry and party spirit; but I have also the pleasure of believing that it has promoted that wider knowledge which will lead to a truer concord."

On this point, as we are introducing to our readers two volumes which are professedly controversial, a few words will not be out of place. There have been those amongst us, as well as in other Dissenting bodies, who conceived that the period of controversy was past, never to be renewed, and that henceforth the propagation of truth must be effected by the indirect but powerful influence of zeal in labours of charity and in the education of the young. We have never been able to understand the logic of this alternative. There is ample room and pressing need for both; and each man amongst us should work according to his capabilities in either field of useful employment, without regarding with jealousy the action of others whose vocation summons them to labour in the other direction. There are men who are able, at fit time and in proper place, to serve the cause of truth on both grounds, as the two authors are known to have done whose works are at this moment before us.

It has been sometimes urged, when we have endeavoured to impress upon our friends the duty of rectifying erroneous common opinions respecting the Unitarian doctrine, that it is a mistake to rely so much upon the intellect of mankind, who are more easily moved in feeling, and to whom the argument of a holy Christian life appeals with greater force than all the syllogisms of scholastic debate. We remark, as before, that we cannot see how the one thing should exclude the other. No reasonable man would ever think of maintaining an appeal to the intellect upon a religious question, in which he could not at the same time rest upon the practical support of a religious life. We have to

persuade as well as to convince; but there is little hope of our succeeding in persuasion if we do not at the same time endeavour to satisfy the intelligence and the judgment of those whom we would bring to the simple truth.

In this matter, as in others not less important, people have grown weary of the form and therefore neglect the substance. The two works which we commend to their attention may assist them to overcome this fastidiousness of liberalism. They will find in these works nothing offensive to any reasonable charity, and no lack of modern interest. Full justice is done to the other side: upon this the authors have evidently laboured with jealous care. The subjects are treated with sustained interest, and with all the condensation which the nature of the case admitted. Mr. Carpenter, though repelling an attack from a near neighbour, is uniformly candid and conciliatory. All that is excellent in the best orthodox treatment of evangelical topics is united in his manner of exposition and argument with the good sense and the calmness peculiar to our own body. In like manner, with all the learned research which they display, and with all their force of philosophic reasoning, the lectures of Mr. Porter are thoroughly practical, the work of one obviously possessed with the desire to win men to the truth as it is in Jesus. He does not notice certain later works of the orthodox schools which exhibit the modifying power of modern knowledge upon the forms of their theological opinion. But this is a small matter. The work condenses the largest and most amply sufficient knowledge of the varied phases of scriptural representation upon the subject of Atonement; while the Appendix, occupying a fourth of the whole volume, is especially interesting and valuable. Several of the notes are of an exhaustive character, forming complete though brief essays upon the most important points, such as required this kind of treatment.

It would not be possible to exaggerate the importance of the subject of the reconciliation of our nature to the Divine will. If this were well comprehended in all its relations to the proper business of human life, no person could ask, with what gospel is our ministry commissioned, or what satisfaction and consolation does it bring to the real wants and interests of sinful men. The reader of these discourses will feel that a preacher must be of singularly cold nature or strangely fettered by idle social conventions, who cannot with the utmost earnestness apply the great lesson of Christianity to the needs of the common modern life. It is the great question of theology, "How shall man be just with his Maker?" It surpasses in practical importance all other questions, and it is one upon which we have the sympathies of large numbers amongst the orthodox, whose theorizings upon the legal value of the death of Christ have been reduced by the progress of general enlightenment to the vaguest spectral form of belief.

There is no topic upon which we can speak from the Scriptures in fuller or more commanding tone; at the same time it is well known that no question is more encumbered in the popular belief with inveterate fallacies and with almost ineradicable prejudices. It is indeed among the most useful labours which the religious teacher can undertake who comes forward to the relief of the people from the mischievous sophisms by which they have been so long deluded. The controversy may grow distasteful to those who no longer need it for themselves; but many of us can well remember what a blessing it would have been to them to have met with such works as those before us in the early days of their struggle into the light of scriptural truth. It should be remembered that a doctrine like ours can only spread by the means of personal conviction. It was so in the times of the apostles. We cannot ensure that our own children should learn it, if, under the impulse of a false liberalism, we refuse to teach them. Much less can we hope for large accessions to our body unless we are prepared to labour, in the spirit of the apostles, "reasoning out of the Scriptures," convincing and converting others as we have been convinced and persuaded ourselves. Such labours have never been without effect when we have vigorously and earnestly pursued them; and if there be any particular in which we can improve upon the controversial writings of a former generation, it is our duty to make the improvement, but certainly not to throw aside the instrument which, with all its imperfections, has fashioned us as a denomination to all the good which our body enjoys.

There is another view in which we are disposed to rate most highly the value of the two works under review. They are thoroughly scriptural. A person cannot read them without deriving from them considerable profit in regard to his knowledge of the sacred books. They afford excellent illustration of the application to these books of those admirable canons of interpretation which the Oxford Professor of Greek has lately set forth. Surely we must all have too sincere a respect for our own position as a needed testimony to the simplicity of scriptural truth, not to wish that the work of enlightened exposition should not be taken out of our hands by men with whose public professions of orthodoxy we cannot sympathize, while their teaching is substantially the same with our own. It ought to be felt as our particular duty to lead the intellect of the time, in conformity with the Christian spirit, in the study of the Holy Scriptures. If we are right in our views, we need not fear to press them upon public attention, which will receive them gratefully when it shall better comprehend them. If in anything we have erred, perhaps by too close an adherence to the superstitions of orthodoxy with its minute verbal inspiration, it is within our power and duty to re-consider and amend,—in any case, to be at the head of the

time in this our special function of real, in opposition to factitious interpretation of the Bible. We entirely agree with Mr. Jowett in his conviction that the true interpretation of the Scriptures, carried out by the free intellect under the guardianship of the Christian heart, is the sole hope of effective union of the divided members of Christ. Do we not know that the Bible is misunderstood? Do we not constantly hear it charged with doctrines which are not the teachings of Christ or of the apostles? Has not our time slipped from under the yoke of a gospel overburdened with inventions of men? Is it not the popular habit with the Scriptures to cause a few scattered texts to tyrannize over the whole sense of their own context and of the entire books to which they belong? We would urge, then, that our instructors should take a lesson from works like those of Mr. Porter and Mr. Carpenter, and prepare themselves to make on every proper occasion full, clear, pointed expositions of the sacred writers. Too much of it there can hardly be, so that it be properly and thoughtfully done. Particularly on the subject of the great reconciliation, the case is hopeless for the unlearned hearer of the gospel if this help to his own private reading of the Bible be unsupplied. The false associations of orthodox Calvinism are too numerous and strong, and they have obtained generally too secure a hold upon certain common feelings, to be broken up without the aid which the pulpit ought to afford of incessant and well-conceived exposition of the Christian books. The following passage, taken almost indiscriminately from Mr. Porter's work (p. 47), will serve to indicate his general views, while it illustrates the value of sound and forcible exposition. We could especially desire that our younger members should be well furnished in this important respect of the knowledge of the Scriptures.

"You will perceive that the whole force of the argument turns upon the meaning of the word '*for*' in the texts which state that Christ died for us, and suffered for us, and shed his blood for us. If that word necessarily signifies '*in our room*' or '*instead of us*,' it would be difficult to resist the interpretation which our brethren are anxious to put upon these passages. But such is not the case. There are in the Greek language, which is the original language of the New Testament, several particles which are indifferently translated by this little word '*for*.' One of these particles (αντι) generally signifies *in the room* or *stead of another*. But this particle is never used in the New Testament when the sacred writers speak of Christ as having 'died for men.' The words which they actually use (προ, υπερ) have a much more comprehensive signification, and imply, what indeed all Christians believe, and none more sincerely than we, that Christ died for *the good* of men, in *their cause*, on *their account*. This fact ought to settle the question, so far as it depends on the interpretation of these texts. The sacred writers had it in their power to employ a phrase which in its obvious meaning would have expressed the doctrine of vicarious punishment; but *they*

have never once employed it. The phrases which they have used simply express a fact which no Christian ever can or ever did deny; a fact which we at least not only admit, but on just occasion constantly assert and strenuously maintain, viz., that the death of Christ was a voluntary death, in the service and for the benefit of mankind. That such is the true interpretation of this language in the passages now under consideration is evident even from some of the texts themselves. Peter, exhorting servants to bear patiently the severities of cruel masters, says, 'For even hereunto were ye called, for Christ also hath suffered for us, *leaving us an example* that ye should walk in his steps' (1 Peter ii. 21). He 'died for us,' i.e. died for our advantage; and one of the advantages that his death conferred is, that we have a pattern of godly meekness under cruel wrong. So also, in 1 John iii. 16: 'Hereby perceive we love, because he laid down his life for us, and *we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren,*' i.e. in their defence, or for their confirmation in the faith. A striking example occurs in the writings of the apostle Paul: 'If one died for all, then were all dead; and he died for all, *that they who live should not live henceforth unto themselves, but unto him who died and rose again for them*' (2 Cor. v. 14), i.e. Christ died *for all*, that all might be prevailed on to walk in newness of life, conformably to the precepts and example of him who died on their behalf. The same apostle says, '*for a good man some would even dare to die*' (Romans v. 7), that is, not to have his sins imputed and to bear his punishment, for that would scarcely be consistent with the fact of his being a good man, but to do him a service or to protect him from injury; and in the very same sense, as the apostle's language clearly implies, 'while we were yet sinners Christ died for us,' that is, died to confer on us advantages and benefits. Remember that the High Priest moved the Sanhedrim to consent to the murder of Jesus by persuading them that it was expedient that *one man should die for the people* (John xi. 50). Not, certainly, *as a vicarious victim*, to bear the penalty of their offences, that was a doctrine of which the unbelieving Jews had no notion; but, as he himself explained his words, he thought it desirable to put Jesus to death in order to ward off from them an impending danger, 'that the whole nation might not perish' under the jealous anger of the Roman government. Christians are exhorted to be ready to die for Christ: 'Unto you it is given, on behalf of Christ (Gr. *for Christ*), not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake' (Gr. *to suffer for him*) (Phil. i. 29). The apostle Paul says that he took pleasure in 'reproaches, persecutions and distresses for Christ's sake' (Gr. *for Christ*) (2 Cor. xii. 10). He says that he 'was always delivered to death for Jesus' sake' (Gr. *because of Jesus*) (2 Cor. iv. 11). And he declared that he endured all things for the elects' sakes (Gr. *because of the elect*), that they also might obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. ii. 10). What pæans would have been sung if this had been affirmed of Christ! I apprehend that no one who calmly considers the force of these expressions, and the manner in which they are applied, will feel any difficulty in explaining the texts in which our blessed Saviour is said to have died, and to have suffered, and to have endured grief, for us."

If the reader compare with this a passage from Mr. Carpenter's lectures (p. 66), he will perceive with what varied interest the

exposition of the sacred writings may be accompanied, and what a field it opens for every resource of ability in the way of illustration and argument.

"I have not forgotten that it is written, 'He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;' but if our righteousness is as unreal as was the sin of Christ, it will profit us little. The latter clause, *who knew no sin*, explains the first, *he hath made him to be sin*. The omniscient God did not regard Jesus as *sin;* on the contrary, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. Christ's obedience unto death was a manifestation of his holiness and goodness. . . . 'God spared not his only Son, but delivered him up for us all.' There were *two* laws,—one, which was *passing away*, by whose administration he was put to death, *that* law, by his death, was repealed. Another, eternal, which by his death was *ratified and sanctified*, the law of love, by which he gave himself to death. So, in the case of the emancipator we spoke of, *he gave himself to death*, he entered on a course in which he knew that he should have to die, in obedience to what he was assured was the will of Heaven; the divine law of love of the enslaved which was glorified in his sufferings; but he was put to death by a law which those who glorified his sufferings hated as unjust and wicked. The law which punishes a righteous man with death, is a law of sin and death; the law which gives the righteous man power to brave, endure and conquer death, is the law of spirit and life. Now, was Jesus *punished by God's law?* No! he was blessed and rewarded by it. How could it punish him while it set joy before him, a joy for which he endured the cross and despised the shame! As well say that the law of maternal love *punishes* the mother who chooses suffering for the unspeakable joy of saving her child. We are not punished when we are permitted to suffer with Christ. When Paul filled up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ for his church's sake, he rejoiced in his sufferings; and whilst the children of the world deem all pain a penalty, those who suffer according to the will of God commit their souls unto him, as to a faithful creator: and we count them blessed as they thus enter into the joy of their Lord. It is, then, when we look at Christ on the cross as the unbelieving Jews did, that we deem him *punished:* when we look on him as we believe that God did, we see him the *beloved of the Father*."

The first of Mr. Carpenter's lectures is on the nature of Sin; the second shews the kingly quality of Mercy compared with the necessary correctional discipline of the Father; the fourth details the scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary; the fifth shews how the life of Christ procures salvation for his faithful followers; the third and sixth enter more fully into the Scripture doctrines of Ransom and Reconciliation. It would not be easy to choose out of so much that might be quoted to advantage; the reader will find his own study of this unassuming work amply rewarded. But we cannot leave it without remarking one happy distinction of Mr. Carpenter's lectures. They are rich in indications of a profound study and interpretation of human nature. The author is extremely ready and apt in illustrations like the following:

"Even in the world, it is the injurer whom it is most difficult to reconcile. When he who does the wrong keeps the bad feeling which led to the wrong, the consciousness of sin turns his animosity to hatred, and makes all advances to reconciliation difficult. The good man who is superior to insult, and can overcome evil with good, waits to be gracious to his insulter: but often waits in vain. He is ready to forgive, but the wrong-doer is not ready to be forgiven. When a child has disobeyed his parent and dreads his displeasure and dwells on his own trespass, his little heart is shrouded in sullen gloom: he feels alienated: he cannot believe that he is forgiven—he thinks that he does not wish to believe it. He shuns him whom he once so loved to meet. He cannot understand the depth of parental affection—how his father is waiting to be gracious to him—till the father by some proof of tenderness reveals his love and wins him back to himself. God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. . . . . Without offers of pardon and spiritual help, how can the sinner return? They were given in the Old Testament: they proceeded from the lips of Jesus: they were manifested in his treatment of sinners: they were ratified when he died for sinners: and when God exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, it was 'to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.'"—P. 141.

The first and the last of Mr. Porter's lectures present a clear and an admirable statement of the scriptural doctrine of reconciliation to the Father. The following passage will read in perfect harmony with the preceding quotation. It is from the concluding lecture.

"Above all, let us thankfully avail ourselves of the mercy which the Father sent the Son into the world to announce to all penitent offenders. Let us not be too proud to accept God's mercy, on God's own terms, as an act of his spontaneous and unpurchased grace. There are some whose language would lead us to suppose that they would think it beneath them to accept forgiveness and mercy unless they could establish a claim to it as due to them by divine justice; if not on account of their own merits, at least on the ground of another's merits as imputed to them! What mind is not shocked by such arrogance and ingratitude! Far be it from us. We feel our need of the proffered mercy; and with an humble and grateful acceptance of the terms on which it is offered, we fly for refuge from our sins and from ourselves to cast ourselves on the bosom of our Heavenly Father, and rush into the everlasting arms which are opened to embrace us."—P. 116.

The second and the seventh lectures record the history of the doctrine of Satisfaction to the times of Grotius, Butler, Magee and Price. The latter of these two lectures concludes with an admirable passage on the varieties of opinion among theologians, suggesting the duty of charity in all our labours in what we believe to be the sacred cause of truth. We must quote the final sentence.

"I confess it is to this silent, but powerful influence of the cross on the hearts of those who with faith and love contemplate it and him who bled upon it that I attribute much of the gentleness, meekness and self-sacrificing benevolence displayed by many of my fellow-christians whose

speculative opinions would appear to be calculated to inspire no feelings but those of stern and unrelenting harshness, but whose lives mark them out as among the purest and most amiable of mankind, the excellent of the earth."—P. 101.

Two lectures are devoted to the argument from Reason and from Scripture in support of the common doctrine, and two to the consideration of objections against it. It will be seen that the whole question is very fully treated. We do not think it needful in this place to follow the author in the examination of each particular. We remark only, that the arguments upon grounds of reason are very clearly and forcibly presented, independently of the reasoning from the Scriptures, which is not unworthy of Mr. Porter's reputation as a biblical scholar. We cordially recommend the work for circulation in our own congregations as well as amongst our orthodox connections. It is well fitted to accomplish the good purpose which has led to its publication.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.*

Though not officially, this book is virtually, a manifesto on behalf of the late "Anti-State-Church Society," now calling itself the "Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control." That Society, chiefly consisting of *orthodox* Dissenters, arose and took up the question of religious liberty at a remarkable period, namely, when the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and of the Catholic disabilities had been followed by the Dissenters' Chapels Act, which, though applying equally to all Dissenters, was immediately necessary for the protection of Unitarians. Till this time, the orthodox Dissenters were scarcely known in politico-religious action. All the above-mentioned concessions to religious freedom had been gained by liberal politicians and Unitarians, with little or no help from orthodox Dissenters, and the last two in the face of their general opposition. But from that time they felt themselves called upon to take up the cause of religious liberty. More had been done than they had approved, but less than they henceforth demanded. They now declared that the abstract principle of religious liberty had not been reached. The new and awkward word *voluntaryism* was coined to express the personal basis of religious profession; and the *Anti-State-Church Association* avowed by its name that the practical object to be

* The Ultimate Principle of Religious Liberty. The Philosophical Argument: with a Review of the Controversy as conducted on Grounds of Reason and Expediency in the Writings of Locke, Warburton, Paley, Dick, Wardlaw, Gladstone, Martineau and Miall. 8vo. Pp. 208. Ward and Co. 1860.

aimed at was neither more nor less than the abolition of the temporal power, wealth and status of the Established Church. It is not necessary to our present purpose to scrutinize the policy which soon dictated the change of that intelligible name for the less definite and very cumbrous title now borne by the Society. Suffice it that the Religious Liberation Society (as it is ambiguously called for brevity's sake) has found its chief sphere of action in perseveringly promoting petitions for the abolition of church-rates, thus practically acknowledging that the *principle* of religious liberty must be reached by detail, if reached at all.

The book before us is a somewhat ambitious attempt to find "the ultimate principle of religious liberty," as a something that has been hitherto missed by all the best seekers for it, from Locke to Edward Miall inclusive.

We shall state the writer's own view and compare it with Locke's (which is the common notion, but is thought to need amendment); and then, without following the author in his criticisms upon other defenders of Establishments, we may surprise and amuse our readers by his estimate of Mr. Martineau as *one of that number*, and also as a writer and thinker in general.

Locke had argued for restricting the civil magistrate to civil affairs, from such palpable reasons as the following: "Because the care of souls is not committed to the civil magistrate, any more than to other men." It is not committed by God; nor can it be vested in the magistrate by the people, because "no man can so far abandon the care of his own salvation as blindly to leave it to the choice of any other, whether prince or subject, to prescribe to him what faith or worship he shall embrace. For no man can, if he would, conform his faith to the dictates of another."

On this our author says:

"Locke seems to have approached very near to that which we conceive to be the primary ground of limitation; but he has failed, as we humbly conceive, to lay hold of it. The absence of authority in the magistrate we of course maintain; but we want the ground or *proof* of this assertion, and that from the reason of the thing; for it is on this basis that the question is here discussed by our philosopher. If asked for this proof on ulterior ground, we should answer, that religious authority and religious duty are antecedent to civil relations and institutions. They attach to the primary moral relations of man, and are therefore independent of and separate from the artificial and conventional relations of mere political citizenship. This is the order of nature —the ordination of God. The religious amenabilities exist anterior to civil government."—P. 27.

And our author in due time announces what he considers the "primary ground of limitation," in these oracular words (p. 36), which also appear on the title-page of the book as its motto:

"No authority can be possessed by any agency but such as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which it arises. No man can be placed in such a moral relationship to his fellow-men as is implied in a dominion over their religious conscience and practice. This, it appears to us, is the true ground of distinction between the different spheres of government in general, and also the foundation and true philosophy of religious liberty."—P. 36.

The want of clearness of expression is the first difficulty in the way of our accepting this alleged *principle*. The first sentence is indeed unintelligible. What is meant by "an agency possessing authority"? An agent might, but hardly an agency. Then do the words *such* and *it* refer to authority or to agency? or one to each? and if so, which to which? "No authority can be possessed by any agency but such [query, authority or agency?] as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which it [query, the authority or the agency?] arises." We confess we cannot make out the proposition designed to be conveyed in these words as a fundamental axiom. We think, but cannot be sure, that the author meant, "such *authority* as is of the same nature with the relationship out of which the *agency* arises." But what then is the meaning of an authority being of the same *nature* with a relationship? Is anything different meant from what Locke had said more simply when he argued that spiritual authority was *inappropriate* or *impossible* in the relationship held by the governor towards the governed? The second sentence just quoted indeed says this very thing: "No man can be placed in such a moral relationship to his fellow-men as is implied in a dominion over their religious conscience and practice." And if this proposition may not be taken as an axiom, we do not think the previous sentence will serve that purpose any better.

Our author is not more lucid in his further developement of his subject than in the statement of his axioms. In distinguishing the different *agencies* and authorities which arise out of different relationships, he actually maintains that the relation of the governor to the governed is *not a moral* relationship, and that it does not imply the enforcement of any moral duties as such! We can hardly persuade ourselves that a thoughtful man, in any degree versed in moral questions, can have deliberately penned the following words:

"Now since the *origin* of moral duty is found in a moral relationship, and since its obligation exists only in consequence of such relation subsisting, all *moral* duties, *as such*, are removed beyond the province of the civil ruler. Arising as they do out of natural and moral relationships, which the civil governor, as such, does not sustain towards the subject, their enforcement by the infliction of civil penalties must therefore be illegitimate."—P. 6.

What! are theft, fraud and murder, not violations of *moral*

duty? And is their control or punishment by civil inflictions illegitimate? Has the civil law of our own country no sanction in universal morals? Is not its strength found in so far as it is the reflection of the general conscience? And where it goes beyond or falls short of the dictates of the general conscience, is not the reform of our civil law for that reason demanded and in due time obtained? Is it not the boast of free institutions to make the law coincide with the general sense of right? Is it not the curse of despotism, and its danger, to defy the moral sentiment of the nation?

We do not fail to observe our author's saving clause, *as such*. He says, "All *moral* duties, *as such*, are removed beyond the province of the civil ruler." And when he further speaks of *civil* duties, he says their obligation "arises out of the relations of men *as members of the same political community*,—not as man to fellow-man, but as subject to fellow-subject. It is not a natural but a conventional relationship out of which this class of duties comes forth." And so, "what may be civil duties in one country or nation, may or may not be such in another" (p. 6).

Of course there are certain civil or political duties obligatory under a monarchy and not in a republic, and *vice versâ*. But those great matters of mutual right which are protected by the civil law of *all* nations, in the punishment of fraud, theft, murder, personal injury, &c.,—are these merely *civil* duties? or are they first moral, and therefore civil? Are the violations of these punished by the civil law because they are wrongs done from man to man, or from "members of the same political community" to each other? Do these belong to the "many acts civilly binding upon an Englishman, from which the subject of any other political government is exempt"? We trifle with morals and with law alike, to argue such questions.

Civil law has to do with morals and nothing but morals, yet not with the whole of morals. There are many parts of morality to which civil sanctions cannot reach. And there may be some matters of law on which the general sense of morals is in conflict, and the balance may ultimately be in favour of the existing law or against it. But to say that the "distinct *origins* of civil authority and of moral authority * * * separate the two and place the subjects of each beyond the jurisdiction of the other," is a new doctrine alike to ethics and jurisprudence. To say that, "springing from relationships quite distinct and essentially different, morals, whether viewed as comprehending religion or not, are wholly beyond the legitimate interference of civil authority," is to repudiate the whole course of civilized justice. Such writers as these give occasion to Mr. Martineau's sardonic remark, that "the strength of voluntaryism lies in the belief that the ends of Christianity are not moral ends."

Law does not comprehend the whole of morals. That is quite

true. What, then, is the limitation? is an important question; and the usual answer is that of Mr. Martineau in the article criticised by our author:

"The State is that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led to comply with *such parts of the moral law* as are *within reach of public reward and punishment.*" (Church and State—Miscellanies, p. 160.)

Again, the same writer excellently says:

"Without attempting to draw any exact boundary around its proper realm—which must indeed vary with the historical conditions by which it is environed—it is clear that it (the State) can take cognizance only of *external actions susceptible of attestation;* that it cannot regulate acts of simple prudence and imprudence; that even of injuries, only those can be brought within its power which admit of *definition and of something like admeasurement both as to their intent and as to their effects.*"

Mr. Martineau indeed adds:

"Though, however, these limitations might be carried further, we altogether deny that they reduce the business of the State to the 'protection of body and goods.' We believe that a government which refuses to attempt more will soon be unable to accomplish this; and that when it *seems* to move with success within these narrow bounds, the order of which it boasts is bequeathed from an age when it aspired to nobler power, and is sustained by sentiments lingering from that better time." (Miscell. p. 159.)

Perhaps Mr. Martineau does not differ, except in words, from those who would restrain the business of the State to the "protection of body and goods," and in so doing would cultivate "the sentiments of the best times."

The practical statesman and the practical moralist are concerned to draw the line wisely and fairly where the State must cease to interpose its sanctions and leave the rest to conscience, to family, to society and (it may be) to the church. Nor is it difficult to draw this line so as to exclude theological interference. But our author does little service either to practical morality or practical statesmanship by endeavouring to "disprove the right of government in *morals and religion alike*" (p. 41), "and to shew that the magistrate *cannot practically* separate the moral from the religious for the purposes of a moral but not a religious administration" (p. 42). It has been the constant aim of the wisest jurists, moralists and anti-state-churchmen, to draw the line between legal morals and a State establishment of theology. And if for the common phrase, *State religion*, we could read *State theology* (which is always meant), the question would be contained in a nutshell. The State religion that is needed is that of Christian morals applied to civil and criminal law; the State theology that is to be deprecated is a very different matter. But our author only confuses the subject. He endeavours to "disprove the right of government in morals and religion alike," and

so to absolve himself from the "obligation to distinguish between the two" (p. 41); and he roundly declares that "the obligation of civil duties arises out of a conventional and not a natural or a moral relationship" (p. 6). He even says that the civil law does not punish theft as an offence against the moral law! These are his words:

"The moral law enjoins, Thou shalt not steal, and holds over its delinquent the retribution of Providence and eternity. The civil law says, If you appropriate the property of your fellow-citizen you shall be punished. Why does it punish? Because the moral law forbids theft? No such thing; but because the civil law itself (very likely in violation of the moral law) had made that piece of property the legal possession of another."—P. 190.

He must be a resolute theorist who can see no moral agency or authority in the consent of society to protect every one's property by the judicial punishment of the thief. Is not this consent of society the evident "retribution of Providence" upon the delinquent? The civil law punishes theft (says our author) because the civil law itself had made that piece of property the legal possession of another! But why had the civil law made it so, unless in obedience to the general sense of the moral rights of property? This question is disposed of in a random and most unworthy parenthesis which, if it means anything, means that the civil law of property violates the moral law as a general rule, and exists for the purpose of doing wrong.

In one instance our author has, we grant, caught Mr. Locke tripping in his principles of toleration; where that great philosopher denies toleration to the atheist on the ground that "promises, covenants and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon him." But we do not see that this inconsistency "seriously vitiates and even maims the whole argument of Locke" (p. 43). It is an inconsistency and a shortcoming in the application of his fundamental principle, that "the commonwealth is a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving and advancing their own *civil interests.*" But Locke makes the exception with a view to maintain his rule, because he thinks "promises, covenants and oaths can have no hold on the atheist." Locke does not say in what manner he would deny toleration to the atheist, and there is no need to think he meant active persecution, or anything beyond the loss of those privileges which attach to the morality of promises, covenants and oaths, from which he believes the atheist's principles to shut him out. Our author shews plainly that "society has no right to insist that the atheist should profess certain religious sanctions of good faith," but has a right to require and compel him "*to keep his word or agreement.*" And in this connection he maintains the uselessness and undesirableness of oaths, a conclusion which may be reached not only from their theore-

tical futility in the case of the atheist, but from the larger fact that the most religious witness is never in any court of justice believed because of his oath, but because his evidence is good and unimpeachable.

We have occupied more space perhaps than the merits of the book before us justify; but not more than is due to the subject, which our author has vainly endeavoured to place upon "what he deemed a more excellent platform of assault" (Preface, p. viii).

We need not pursue his review of other writers since Locke, in which he thanks Warburton for the undisguised worldliness of his theory of Church and State; laughs rather vulgarly at Paley's "sago spoon" and "argument made easy;" discusses more laboriously Gladstone's idea of the State having a personal conscience that requires a Church Establishment; and finds even his friends Dick and Miall falling something below his own "more excellent platform of assault."

But perhaps his most laboured review is the one devoted to Mr. Martineau, whose numerous friends and admirers among our readers may be curious to see what this ultra-voluntaryist of orthodoxy has to say of that remarkable man. An article on "Church and State" in the Prospective Review for May, 1845 (since republished in Mr. M.'s volume of Miscellanies), furnishes the groundwork of the criticism. We must gently protest against this article being regarded as in any sense "a manifesto of the views of that not very numerous but influential class of religious philosophers who are connected with the Unitarian churches." We do not think it is true of the Unitarians that "they do not on any other ground (than that of theology) object, *as a body*, to State support of religious institutions." The "free eclecticism" which, as our author declares, "prevails among this select and highly-cultivated class of thinkers," renders it difficult to make the estimate, and impossible to hold the body in general responsible for the views of any member, however eminent.

But has this writer correctly estimated Mr. Martineau's own position in the Church-and-State controversy? He describes him as "taking his place among the advocates of a State-supported religious institute" (p. 157). It is not by any means clear to us that this is the fact. Mr. M.'s paper on Church and State is purely theoretical, abstract and philosophical. We do not see that it is designed to touch at any practical point our concrete question of Church-of-Englandism. He shews "that the influences which we denominate by the word *Church* constitute no new element special to Christian nations;" but "were in truth comprised in the Hellenic idea of the *State;* which was not equivalent, as with us, to the mere aggregate of individual interests in respect to physical good, but represented all those moral ends which transcend personal happiness, and constitute the τελειότατον τέλος of human life" (Miscell. p. 107). Mr. Martineau's

essay is intirely hypothetical and abstract, and has no relation to any such vulgar question as the abolition of church-rates. Beginning with the Greek philosophical Utopias (not with the Greek commonwealths), he gives a "brief account of the disturbances which have interrupted the original partnership between the two elementary powers of society," and endeavours to collect "some augury as to their possible re-approximation" (p. 156). In doing this, he seems for a while to keep the Church and State distinct enough; the former being "that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led towards compliance with *the whole moral law*, through *reverence;*" the latter, "that system of organized agencies by which men in society may be led to comply with *such parts of the moral law* as are *within* the reach of public reward and punishment" (p. 160).

When we had read thus far (and it is within two pages of the end of the essay), we confess we took Mr. M. for a pure voluntary of the first water. We admired his clear definitions of Church and State, and wanted nothing more to prove to us that they must be separate and distinct. *The whole moral law through reverence* defines the aim of the purest voluntaryism; *such parts as are within the reach of public reward or punishment,* is a good description of the legislator's and magistrate's province.

But Mr. Martineau himself spoils all at last, and leaves a perfect chaos, corresponding to that of the English question of Church and State:

"The State authorities may have the *right* to aid the Church; but suppose they cannot find it; that the national sources of reverence lie among the unorganized agencies, and have deserted the visible ecclesiastical system," &c. "What then is to be done? Can the right take effect? or, for want of the proper historical conditions, must it be inactive till better times? We shall not attempt to resolve these questions now; anxious, in tracing our path through the theory of polity, to admit no disturbances from the sceptic laugh and fanatic fears and party rage that confuse every entrance on its practice."—Pp. 161, 162.

Truly a "conclusion in which nothing is concluded"! We certainly do not conclude Mr. Martineau to be an advocate of the State Church of England, nor even of *a* State Church. We may indeed agree with our author that, "whether as listeners or as readers, we never met with a teacher whom we admired so much and who convinced us so little." We may agree with him that Mr. Martineau is not "his own equal in the analytic and synthetic powers of intellect:"

"Let him undertake the analysis and presentation of even the scarcely palpable conceptions of Coleridge, and we follow him with the assurance that a sympathetic spirit interprets to us the oracles of genius. But the moment we perceive the transition from the region of interpretive analysis to that of positive construction, we feel that we need a fresh guide and interpreter to assure us that we even apprehend, much more *accept*, the hypothesis." (Phil. Argum. p. 166.)

The essayist also says, not without some show of reason,—

"He may love philosophy much, but he loves mysticism more. As in the case of Mr. Gladstone, all the beautiful translucency of Mr. Martineau's style is frequently seen in the expression of those shadowy conceptions and sentiments habitual to an order of mind in which the poetic element prevails over the philosophical; and hence the luxuriant revelry of sentimental expatiation which, in spite of his critical scepticism, characterizes most of his productions."—P. 176.

In one respect, however, our essayist is quite mistaken in his estimate of Mr. Martineau. He lays all his sins, philosophical, æsthetic and political, upon an imagined all-engrossing bias to theology! It is quite amusing to see how he returns again and again upon his own ridiculous theory:

"Many passages in the writings of this singularly gifted and liberal-spirited man are sadly disfigured by the most virulently sectarian spirit." "From beginning to end theology rules the creed of Mr. Martineau in this matter." "We feel that that ugly enemy of all truth, Sectarian Prejudice, has been allowed to lead captive a noble-minded foeman." "In this essay, as in many of his other writings, there may frequently be caught a glimpse of the hoofs and horns of that vicious monster, Theological Bigotry."

Has the writer of these passages read Mr. Martineau's recent non-sectarian, non-theological, non-Unitarian pamphlets? Apart from these *extravaganzas*, it is simply absurd to represent Mr. Martineau as sectarian or theological. He is metaphysical, philosophical, abstract, perhaps visionary,—but not theological, not sectarian. Such an estimate is absurd.

There is more consistency in representing him as the advocate of personal religion and religious conviction, and reproaching him from this point of view with his supposed leaning to a State Establishment:

"Mr. Martineau, like the rest of us, starts off as a non-sectarian, non-theological theorist." "Here is the apostle of the essentially personal nature of sin and goodness, dreaming side by side with Mr. Gladstone in the interest of a nationally religious responsibility." "Yet with what terrible havoc does he play his artillery of denunciation against this very same principle, in the shape of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Established Church of England, under penalty of the forfeiture of its temporal advantages!"

And there may be some propriety in the following criticism, applicable to not a few other men of powerful and ready speech:

"His otherwise enviable talent of expression is attended with the usual drawback. In his case, language is so adroit and potent a faculty that we experience a mortifying disappointment on discovering, as not unfrequently happens, that, just at the critical point in the mental operation, it has ceased to act under control. No longer a passive instrument, but a power acting on its own account. The horse has run away with his rider. The dignity and power of self-possession are lost, and no air of ease and majesty assumed can deceive the practised observer."

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter V.

GLASGOW.

Mr. Harris commenced his ministry in Glasgow by conducting three services in Union-Street chapel, on Sunday, October 2, 1825. The text of his first sermon was Acts x. 29: "I ask, therefore, for what intent ye have sent for me?" The very next Sunday he delivered the first of a course of evening lectures on subjects relating to Christian doctrine, which was continued until the end of January, 1826. During the delivery of these lectures, the chapel was crowded to excess in every part, and some hundreds frequently went away from the doors, being unable to obtain admission. So great was the public interest excited by them, that their immediate re-delivery was requested, and they were repeated, on Sunday afternoons and evenings, from February 12 till the end of April. The chapel library was found quite inadequate to supply the demand for books which was made upon it in connection with these services; and the gratuitous distribution of large numbers of tracts was resorted to, in order to meet the desire for information which was so plainly manifested. While these efforts were being made to enlist public sympathy in favour of the cause of Unitarianism, other efforts were, with equal success, undertaken which had in view the internal improvement of the congregation. It was wisely considered that the best means of congregational prosperity would be afforded by mutual exertion for some common objects; and accordingly a Benevolent Society for the relief of the sick was instituted and a Sunday-school established. The former soon numbered nearly a hundred members, and the latter contained a hundred and sixty children. Each of these organizations was not only watched but conducted by Mr. Harris himself, inasmuch as he continually gave his personal assistance toward the carrying out of their business. Some years afterwards, in order that the Sunday-school might not fail, he took the entire management of it into his own hands, teaching therein from Sunday to Sunday, in addition to all his other arduous duties on that day. While thus engaged "in labours more abundant" at home, he shewed himself ready, by preaching and visiting, to seize every opportunity of promoting the spread of Unitarianism abroad. The missionary work which he did in this first year was of itself remarkable. Before the close of the year, too, he commenced the editorship of *The Christian Pioneer*, the possible existence and support of which in Scotland would alone prove the greatness of the change he had been able to produce. He had his reward in the result which the close of the year declared. Whereas the income of the chapel from all

sources could not previously have amounted to two hundred pounds per annum, the amount this year was swelled to four hundred and thirty-six pounds. He thus became the master of his position, and was cheered by the congratulations and the joyful anticipations of his friends, who were deeply conscious that what had been done was effected by his personal power emphatically. Considering the place and the time, a truly wonderful work had so far been wrought, and the author of it had the additional satisfaction of feeling that he had acted throughout it with the utmost disinterestedness. He had carried out his faith in the truth, "that it was more blessed to give than to receive:" for of the large sum which he had been the means of collecting only two hundred and twenty-five pounds fell to his share. The rest was absorbed in the payment of the interest of a heavy debt, and in the necessary expenses connected with the place and mode of worship. Small as this stipend was in itself, he knew it to be great in proportion to the means of his congregation. Its value was immeasurably increased by the fact that they were doing their utmost for his support in every way. It was a noble thing, that, burdened as they were, they should have engaged, from the first, to give him more than their whole receipts at the time amounted to; and now, in exceeding that engagement, "the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality."

The labour of this first year was but a specimen of the labours with which all the succeeding years of his Glasgow ministry were filled. Nay, as the years went on, the calls to new labour on his part continually multiplied: and we find him ever ready to meet each fresh emergency with augmented vigour.

"What his reason and conscience dictated, that his will was strong enough to execute. The strength of his will was singularly proportioned to the extent of his insight into the sphere of Christian duty: so that, on the one side, he was not troubled by any vague fear of having mistaken his path; and, on the other, was not tormented with remorse for leaving undone the duty he knew. Herein, indeed, lay the secret of much of his power. He walked earth with the strength of a man who in the morning knew what his day's work was, and felt himself capable of faithfully discharging it; and in the evening retired to rest having done what he intended."*

The general character and effect of his preaching at this time is thus described by Mr. M'Kean, in an account of his own conversion to Unitarianism with which I have been favoured:

"I went out one Sunday morning 'not knowing whither I went.' On passing the Unitarian chapel, some months before, I had heard the singing, accompanied by the organ, as I listened on the pavement outside, and I thought it very beautiful.

* Mr. Crosskey's Funeral Sermon.

Thitherward I bent my steps: and felt no danger, because, years before, I had, as I thought, beaten some of the best Unitarians in Paisley, in a written correspondence on religious matters. I entered the chapel and first noticed a number of children there. I pitied the poor little things because they could not judge for themselves: but I hardened my heart against the adults. I had heard that the minister was a great orator, and I put myself specially upon my guard. Shortly he entered the pulpit, and sat down for two or three minutes. When he rose, his fine, manly appearance won my favour. Surely, I thought, he can be no intentional deceiver. He read, in his deep tones, a sweet Sabbath hymn which was new to me, and the sentiment of it thrilled through my heart. I had determined to be a silent observer, but that became impossible. As I knew the tune well, I began to hum the bass, but in the last verse I brought out a ringing counter. The prayer was rather short according to my habits, but solemn, beautiful and glowing with benevolence. The reading of the lessons was superior to anything I had ever heard before, and the sermon was practical in its character and preached with calmness and dignity. I left the chapel imagining that Unitarianism might possibly not be the cold system of disbelief I had supposed it to be. What surprised me most was an intimation that the Lord's Supper would be celebrated the next Sunday. I wondered what business Unitarians could have with that ordinance, and I went again on that day to get at the secret. I was as delighted with the devotional services then as formerly. I resolved, however, to withdraw myself for a time from the chapel, for I feared Mr. Harris was carrying me off with him without due consideration on my part. But the charmer had got hold of me, and the next Sunday morning found me at the chapel once more. I did not pass unnoticed; for besides being a new man, it was observed that I always used a Greek Testament, and was diligent in turning to the quotations that were made. I was offered the use of books from the library, and I obtained thence the first Unitarian book I ever read. Books, however, did not stir me as did Mr. Harris's noble preaching. It was as scriptural as it was heart-stirring; and scripture had, all my life, been to me the court of final appeal. The authority of the Scriptures, indeed, underwent in my mind a great change. In place of submitting to all their words, I learnt to lay hold of their great principles: and by this means, I obtained, through the Scriptures, I feel solemnly assured, a more spiritual faith, a more intelligible theology, and a more heartfelt religion. The Scotch must have the Bible, and indeed the common people everywhere must; and no man ever made a better use of it than did our departed friend.

"He had no sympathy with those who generalized doctrines, and supposed one to be as good as another; but he felt it his

duty to establish a church whose fundamental principle was the Fatherhood of God, which, however uncompromisingly adverse it might be to party doctrines involving partial salvation, was in charity with men of every creed and colour and country. Another element of the great success of Mr. Harris's preaching was his strong faith in his principles. The fashion of the world might pass away, but he believed they could not. He had consequently a definite message to deliver, a distinct gospel to preach. He had no doubt as to what he was to declare, and no double meaning in declaring it. He was singularly clear in his statements, so that the people could 'search the Scriptures and see whether the things were so.' Not only was he a firm believer in the truth he professed, but he also relied upon its suitableness for the deliverance of the world from sin and its advancement in holiness. He deliberately thought that no other form of faith could undermine the tyrannies of the world, destroy the institution of slavery, make an end of war, and realize the visions of prophets and holy men of old: but that under the influence of Unitarian Christianity, the ignorance and error, the degradation and demoralization, the craft and cruelty, which had laid waste the divine nature of whole populations, would gradually decline and die, and go into utter annihilation. Hence proceeded his missionary spirit: and his powerful attacks upon Calvinism, the prevailing and terrifying delusion of his day, were dictated by a pure benevolence. The exposure of religious error was one form in which his spirit girt itself to do battle for humanity. His religion was no abstraction, but, as he apprehended it, a power of God unto salvation, competent to deliver the whole creation from the bondage of corruption.

"Year after year his chapel was filled to overflowing with quiet and attentive hearers, all of whom, in Scotch fashion, had the psalms and hymns of the Kirk in their pockets: and when, at those evening services, Mr. Harris, as he was accustomed to do, employed the book of paraphrases, what glorious bursts of sound followed up the efforts of his eloquence! The organ was drowned, though its whole power was put on, by the hearty response of the crowded congregation. Never again shall I enjoy such rapture till I get to heaven, and join the vast multitude which no man can number."

In the spring and summer there were two services, morning and afternoon, held every Sunday; and, throughout the autumn and winter months, a third service was generally added in the evening. The morning and afternoon services were chiefly devoted to the edification of the regular congregation, and the evening service was almost always directed to the exposure of some popular error or the advocacy of some controverted truth, as truth and error were estimated by the preacher. His choice of subjects was invariably an expression of his strong faith that the

true happiness of man was permanently centred in the conversion of the world to the worship and service of God as the universal Father. There was, I understand from various sources, a marked difference between the manner in which the evening services were conducted and that which distinguished the services in the former part of the day. The morning service was quiet, sensible, serious, and gone through with dignity and solemnity, but without any strong emotion. In the evening the orator and declaimer came forth. The same unimpassioned method as before prevailed in the introductory proceedings—clear and impressive, and adapted to restrain rather than to encourage excited feeling. But when the ice was broken in the sermon, the eye began to kindle and the voice to assume the variations and modulated intonations of the splendid organ that it was. There was a frequent thrusting forth of the arm, and occasionally—but very occasionally—the arm would be uplifted and the hand descend. The very most was made of the matter that could be made of it. In the midst of violent storms of indignation, gleams of the sweetest sunshine would break forth, and tender showers of the softest pathos would vary the scene. The quarterly sacramental services were of another character still,—most beautiful and touching in their accommodation to a deeper tone of sentiment than was elsewhere expressed. "You can scarcely," says Mr. George Hope, "praise Mr. Harris's eloquence too much. His serious and earnest manner, his command over his fine voice, whether raised in denunciation of wrong or lowered to earnest and affectionate pleading, entirely carried his audience with him. His greatest power lay in his direct appeals to the best feelings and instincts of our common humanity, making men know within themselves that he spoke the truth."

The pastoral duties of his situation were discharged by this popular preacher with the same zeal and assiduity with which his pulpit work was performed. He knew all his people intimately, and was ever ready to give counsel and assistance to all, whatever the nature of their exigencies might be. He would in bad weather gird himself up to a weary day's work of begging for a poor family of his flock that had fallen into distress.

To the students in the Glasgow University with whom he could form a connection, and especially to that class of them who passed through the University as Dr. Williams's bursars, he was especially kind and attentive. He took an interest in all their affairs. He treated them with a genial hospitality. He encouraged them in their labours, and manifested the greatest pleasure in their success. He did whatever he could to attach them to the services of his chapel, and called forth their talents for the ministry to which they were destined by employing them in preaching and teaching as opportunities offered. During the sixteen years' continuance of his Glasgow ministry, a considerable

number of these students were brought into intimate relations with him. Many of them have since occupied, and still occupy, influential positions as English Unitarian ministers; and their obligations to him are not by any means confined to what he did for them when they were placed under his immediate notice, but extend to the beneficial effect which his intercourse with them had upon their future professional course. I can trace that effect more or less in the instances of this kind with which I am personally acquainted, and that always in some specially characteristic form.

The pecuniary difficulties with which the Glasgow congregation had to contend cannot be passed over in silence. In the year 1828, Mr. Harris undertook an English journey to collect subscriptions toward paying off the debt with which the chapel was burdened. He travelled nearly two thousand miles, and obtained a sum of six hundred pounds. Still the debt continued to be very oppressive; and yet, in 1834, the chapel was enlarged at an expense of between two and three hundred pounds, which was raised by the congregation alone; and in 1835, a purse of one hundred guineas was presented by them to their pastor. This last act of generosity cannot be mentioned without connecting it with a similar act on the part of the pastor toward his flock. In the year 1838, in consequence of some money losses among those attached to him, he voluntarily gave up £30 of his inadequate salary. The liberal and self-sacrificing spirit which thus shewed itself could not, however, avail to remove the financial embarrassment. The whole of Mr. Harris's active ministry was troubled and fettered by responsibilities which had been contracted at the first erection of the chapel. He had to renew his applications to friends at a distance for aid from time to time, and to repeat his journeyings from place to place, in order to collect with his own hand the money that was needed. One cannot but think that this ought not so to have been. That this people, tried with fire as they were in every other way, should have been left to struggle with this particular evil, which the wealthier churches that were "at rest" in the South could so easily have swept away, is still to be lamented. What was done under these disadvantages we know, but we cannot estimate how much was obliged to be left undone. The evil still exists. The Glasgow congregation has at the present time to do battle against a debt which it has inherited from the foundation of its interest. The removal of this debt would, I have reason to believe, raise that congregation to a state of efficiency as to its resources with which few Unitarian congregations could compare; and if, by means of such facts as those before us, a sense of the duty devolving upon us as Christians to help forward the work of Christian truth and freedom wheresoever the help is wanted should be more deeply experienced, we ourselves shall profit by it beyond

any benefit we may confer upon others: "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the wants of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings to God."

One marked fact connected with the Glasgow congregation was its fluctuating character. It never consisted of the same persons for any length of time, and the multitude of persons who may be said to have passed through it was very great indeed. At every evening service there were scores of strangers present, many of whom, though they first came from curiosity, afterwards habitually came from choice. The attendance of these parties was, however, frequently discontinued. In this respect the congregation differed as widely as possible from the mass of English Unitarian congregations, which have been distinguished for their want of change. Indeed, the difference relates not to Unitarianism in Glasgow only, but to Scotch Unitarianism generally. It would, I think, be wrong to attribute this fluctuation to any inaptitude or deficiency in the ministry. There were plainer causes for it than that; and these other causes operated more strongly in proportion as the administration was more attractive. The greater the numbers drawn together by the extraordinary power of the preacher, the greater was likely to be the defalcation when ordinary influences exerted their normal effect. "The fear of the folk," which is scarcely felt amid the excitement of a new enthusiasm, falls upon the heart with a heavier weight when, in the usual course of things, the enthusiasm passes away. A theological controversy may for a time supply energy and zeal to its eager partizans; but it is religious cultivation, not theological ardour, which must keep a man steady in his church associations, and the controversialist may become alienated in spirit from religion by the very vigour of the opposition he conducts. The attraction of Mr. Harris's eloquence was most powerfully felt by young men not settled in life, who, when they afterwards married and thus came under stronger social influences, yielded to the increased temptation to escape from the discomfort of their heretical position. Great numbers of the persons who joined the Union-Street congregation did not remain in Glasgow, but became scattered through the world. The young men who adopted the Unitarian faith were energetic beyond the average. Such men, in Scotland, very often either emigrate to foreign countries or remove to the large cities of England, and thus the superiority of the element engaged increased the danger of its being withdrawn from this particular use. Still, when we look beyond the immediate interest of the chapel itself, such circumstances as I have just alluded to give us a more important view of the benefits arising from Mr. Harris's ministry than the mere establishment of a settled congregation could afford. No man could remain under that ministry even for a few months without gaining a certain amount of education in liberal principles which would

affect the tenor of his whole future life and modify all his relations with others. He would neither be the same man himself, nor would his conduct in the world produce the same result, as would have been the case had he been destitute of this training. I should imagine very few of these persons really went back to the belief of orthodoxy. Though many of them may now be members of orthodox churches, they have carried wherever they have gone a spirit that has in some measure counteracted the prejudice and bigotry of the associations into which they were thrown. No one can estimate the amount of influence which has been exerted in the manner I have endeavoured to describe. Traces of it are continually to be observed, under the most unexpected circumstances, in Scotch society, and it must have very widely operated in all parts of the globe. It should be remembered that what good has been thus done mainly arose from the popular form in which Mr. Harris set forth his doctrines, and the oratorical reputation which he was able to establish in their favour. His fame as a speaker to whom it was a delight to listen, had its disadvantages in relation to the cause he advocated, but it had eminent advantages which nothing else could have produced. The crowd on which he acted had afterwards to be winnowed; but to collect that crowd and to sow the seed broadcast among it was the right method of commencing the work by which the children of the kingdom might be made to spring up and bring forth fruit on the field of the world.

The controversies in which Mr. Harris was engaged while he remained in Glasgow were strikingly descriptive of the relation he sustained to the religious public by whom he was encompassed. He was excluded from all Christian association, and not permitted freely and according to his station to unite in the promotion of objects of general utility to which he was attached. He had to protest against the intolerance of one minister who refused to meet him at a funeral where he was expected to officiate, saying, "I cannot attend: I cannot say Amen to Mr. Harris's prayers." He had to reprove another minister for announcing as the subject of a lecture, "Unitarian Morality as much opposed to Christian Morality as is the Doctrine of Christ to the Doctrine of Devils." He had to expose the shameless conduct of a newspaper editor who had inserted in his journal, under the head of Cross Readings—"On sabbath evening last, an eloquent discourse was preached in the Unitarian chapel by the Rev. George Harris to a crowded——assemblage of pickpockets, prostitutes and other disorderly characters who frequent the place." He had to complain of the conduct of various individuals, both private and official, who interfered to prevent him from occupying public rooms which he had hired or was about to hire for the purpose of his religious services. He had to remonstrate with the conductors of a Tract Society who pub-

lished in their Report a very injurious statement concerning him, but who refused to give up the name of the author of the statement or the names of the parties concerned in it. He had to direct attention to the proceedings of a Glasgow Presbytery which sanctioned the decision of a church session, to the effect that one of its members "should be censured and admonished for having on several occasions, and particularly on the evening of a communion sabbath, left his own church and worshiped in the Rev. George Harris's Unitarian chapel." He had to plead against the injustice of the Glasgow Bible Society, which formally excluded "all who do not profess the Protestant faith and a belief in the Holy Trinity from holding office in the Society." He had to vindicate his Unitarianism against representations of its evil tendency which were grounded upon the fact that a poor murderer under sentence of death expressed a wish to see him. On all these occasions of defence he gave to the local circumstances which called for his interference an application bearing upon some general principles of truth and righteousness; and there were other occasions on which the discussion of such principles formed the direct purpose of his efforts in opposition to others; but no one can look over such topics as I have enumerated, and which do not by any means exhaust the list of matters of the same kind I could bring forward, and not see that the main stress of controversy with which he had now to do related not to the legitimate statement of any difference of opinion, but to the perpetration of social wrongs inflicted under the shelter of that difference. When this state of things is vividly called to mind, it confers a heroism upon the man who passed through the trial so courageously and cheerfully—nay, with such a hopeful pride—as we know this man to have done. There he stood, year after year, amid a hard, harsh, alienated and hostile community, all the respectable people looking on him with scorn, shunned and avoided, misrepresented and vilified by the multitude, shut out from the common interests of society, expecting to encounter a fresh foe at every turn of affairs,—but self-poised and independent, a brave exile from another and more friendly land, who had voluntarily separated himself to the work of his ministry that he might thus the better confess Christ before men.

While thus standing alone, Mr. Harris did not by any means neglect to forward by his own personal exertions every social or civil object which answered to his views of human liberty and progress. He introduced questions of this kind into *The Christian Pioneer*, as freely as he did questions that were distinctively religious: and he pressed them upon public attention by means of pamphlets and lectures and sermons. At a very early period of his settlement, he projected a petition against the Test and Corporation Acts, which in ten days received three thousand,

eight hundred and seventy signatures. He preached and published a sermon explanatory of his reasons for not observing the National Fast which was commanded in 1832. He celebrated the passing of the Reform Bill by a thanksgiving discourse on the subject of universal liberty. He took every opportunity of denouncing and opposing slavery, whether existing under English or American rule. He attached himself strongly to the Temperance movement, and became a teetotaller, not because he needed or preferred such abstinence on his own account, but because he thought it strengthened his moral influence. He promoted the cause of national education, though he was not permitted even to speak at a social meeting which was held after the delivery by James Simpson of a course of lectures on that subject. It was objected, by a person to whom the intention of asking Mr. Harris to speak was mentioned, that such a proposal could not be entertained; for that a gentleman who had purchased three tickets for Mr. Simpson's lectures, on seeing Mr. Harris present, went home and burned them all; and that another individual, observing Mr. Harris nod approbation to some of Mr. Simpson's statements, resolved he would hear no more, and did not return again. He never shrank from supporting and defending religious voluntaryism and exposing the evils of a Church Establishment, although he had to suffer more from the bigotry of the professed voluntaries of Glasgow than from the adherents of the Kirk, and was shunned by them in their professed endeavours to promote the voluntary cause as one of whose aid they were ashamed. He upheld the true principles of religious liberty against Protestant dogmatism and exclusion by celebrating the Tricentenary of the Reformation in sympathy with the Church of Geneva; and he watched over those principles continually, pointing out, from time to time, the violations of them which were committed by the churches around him, whether they affected his own opinions or not. He exerted himself most strenuously against capital punishment. His lectures on that subject excited throughout Scotland the greatest interest. They were delivered in Glasgow three several times within six months. They were delivered twice in Edinburgh and twice in Aberdeen, and also in Paisley, Falkirk, Kilmarnock, Tillicoultry, Bonhill, Kirkintillock, Campsie, Bridgeton, Johnstone and Dalry. Sometimes their delivery took place in churches, and it was frequently requested by associated bodies of persons as well as by large numbers of scattered individuals. Religious prejudice was in a great measure put on one side in connection with this particular movement, but it occasionally manifested itself decidedly enough even here. When the Rev. Patrick Brewster, for instance, one of the ministers of the Abbey, Paisley, who was notorious as a political and social reformer, was asked to sign a requisition from the inhabitants of Paisley to Mr. Harris, asking him to deliver

three lectures there, he declined to do so on the declared ground that, though he agreed with Mr. Harris in the principles of the lectures, he considered him "a very dangerous man."

But the most remarkable manifestation of a public kind, unconnected with the promotion of his religious views, which he made, related to what was called the Rathcormac Massacre. This massacre involved the slaughter of nine persons and the wounding of eight others in an attempt to execute a distraint for tithe by military force. The military were accompanied by the Rev. W. Ryder, the Archdeacon of Cloyne, to whom the payment of the tithe was due. The person on whom the demand was made was a widow of the name of Ryan, and among the victims of the slaughter was her own son. The case excited at the time of its occurrence the strongest feelings of indignation and horror, and was justly considered as a legitimate testimony to the shocking character of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland. On Sunday morning, January 18, 1835, Mr. Harris preached a sermon on the subject of this event. At the request of his hearers, it was preached again to a very large and deeply attentive congregation on the evening of the same day. He engaged to repeat it the next Sunday afternoon, provided a collection was made for the families of those who were shot on the melancholy occasion that called it forth. It was listened to the third time by as large an audience as could possibly be contained within the walls of the building. Many hundreds could not get in, and before the worship began, a notice had to be posted on the chapel to the effect that the sermon would be repeated for the fourth time the same evening. It was immediately published, and in the space of one week four large editions of it were called for. The copy now lying before me has "nineteenth edition" on its title-page.

This discourse was singularly well adapted to its purpose, and full of the power which a direct statement of a very strong case exerts. There is in it no beating about the bush. It comes right home to the points aimed at, and lays bare with a stroke the feeling it desires to touch. It is remarkably free from mere sentimentalism or any attempt at high-flown description. The native interest of the subject is increased by this unaffected treatment of it. As might be inferred from the text, to which I have alluded in a former chapter, the sermon mainly consists of a parallel between the conduct of our Saviour toward the widow of Nain and the conduct of this minister of his religion toward the Rathcormac widow; and the parallel is made to illustrate the contrast between "Christianity and Church-of-Irelandism:"

"The ecclesiastical dignitary did visit the widow indeed, but it was to leave her more afflicted than he found her. The plague-spot of mammon was on him when he went: the blood of the widow's son besmeared his sacerdotal garment on his return. . . . . The visit of Jesus

was a visit of mercy—that of his professed servant was an errand of rigour. Many of his disciples went with Jesus and much people—a hired soldiery armed with the death-weapons followed the ecclesiastic. Death had occurred ere Jesus drew nigh to the city: death was the result of the approach of his professed follower. When the Lord saw her of Nain, he had compassion on her: when the self-styled minister of Jesus saw the widow who was his debtor, he forgot the Christian in the creditor. . . . . But marvel not at the contrast. It is between an Archdeacon of the Established Church of Ireland and the Saviour of the world."*

The transaction under notice very much increased Mr. Harris's popularity and extended his influence. On a visit he paid to Ireland during the year in which the sermon was published, he was received with a kind of triumph. Resolutions of thanks to him for it were voted by various bodies in different parts of the three kingdoms. He was threatened with prosecution—it was said government prosecution—but the threat only called forth ample offers of support. Daniel O'Connell declared his willingness to plead his cause if the prosecution should take place, and as a practical evidence of sympathy the Liberator gave a subscription to the Glasgow Unitarian chapel. Bishop Murdoch, the Roman Catholic prelate of Glasgow, also subscribed to the testimonial which has been before referred to as having been presented to Mr. Harris. "Never," said he, "did I give a subscription so cheerfully as this. I give it not as to the Unitarian minister, but to the advocate of Catholic emancipation — the friend of the injured and oppressed—the preacher of pure morality—and who exhibits in his life the morality he inculcates."

I must here, somewhat abruptly, close the present chapter. I have only endeavoured in it to describe Mr. Harris's Glasgow course in relation to those matters which were identified with or immediately sprung out of his connection with Glasgow itself. There is another phase of his ministry which remains to be noticed—that embraced by the efforts he made to spread Unitarianism in Scotland beyond the circle of Glasgow means and opportunities. What I have to say on that topic must be reserved for the next chapter.

WHAT ATHENS HAS DONE FOR REASON AND LIBERTY.

All the triumphs of truth and genius over prejudice and power, in every country and in every age, have been the triumphs of Athens. Wherever a few great minds have made a stand against violence and fraud, in the cause of liberty and reason, there has been her spirit in the midst of them, inspiring, encouraging, consoling; by the lonely lamp of Erasmus; by the restless bed of Pascal; in the tribune of Mirabeau; in the cell of Galileo; on the scaffold of Sidney.—*Lord Macaulay.*

---

* Christianity and Church-of-Irelandism, pp. 14, 15.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OR PETITIONS OF PAUL BEST, THE UNITARIAN CONFESSOR.

In a former volume of the Christian Reformer (IX. 493—503), we gave a memoir of Paul Best and of his remarkable pamphlet entitled "Mysteries Discovered." During his tedious imprisonment in the Gatehouse, he addressed two letters to Lenthall, the Speaker, the originals of which we recently met with in the invaluable MS. collections of Bishop Tanner.

The first letter, thus described in the Index, is to be found in Vol. lix. p. 525: "Paul Best, prisoner in the Gatehouse—letter to Lenthall, begging for a day of hearing, to vindicate himself from the charge of blasphemy, Sept. 5, 1646."

Right worthie and worshipful Sir,—May it please you, in regard of my long and close imprisonment in this place ever since the beginning of July, 1645, to reflect upon that of Deut. xxv. 3, not to exceed in punishing, but as a good and gracious Christian, as Pet. iii. 8, to shewe yourselfe pittiful and courteous in expediting a time for me to answere whatsoever can be objected against my cause in vindicating that firste and greate commandment, and cleareing the heavenlie Trinity of all Romish and Popish ——— and innovation (?); and that you would be pleased to put the hon. House in minde of a hearing for me, being driven to a greater exigent (?). I hope by this they have leisure to thinke upon the libertie of their distressed liege and loving subject and servant. Thus, in presumption of your worship's worthe and candour, I make bolde to trouble, if not abuse, your patience, which I humbly desire you to pardon; so I shall remain,

A most observant servant of your worthe and worship,

Paul Best.

From the Gatehouse in Westminster, Sept. 5, 1646.

To his truely honoured William Lenthall, Esq., Speaker. This with my humble service present.

Endorsed—Paul Best's letter, Sept. 5, 1646. Bundle 4th, from Sept. till Dec. 1646.

The second letter (Vol. lviii. p. 224) is described in the Index, "Petition of the same to the same effect, June *(January?)* 21, 1647."

Hon. Sir,—Whereas your petitioner having formerly had experience of your worthe and understanding when he was called to the bar before your hon. House,—according to his writings he did not deny the matter of the heavenlie Trinitie according to holy Scripture; but for the manner (according to Athanasius his simbole in that abolished liturgie) that it is a Popish doctrine or Romish tradition, and masse of contradictions concerning God and Christ Jesus our blessed Saviour. Alsoe there being an ordinance of Parliament thereupon, viz., that the terme Person being no where in Scripture applied to God, nor yet used in the Church of 300 and more yeares after Christ, that no persone should be mulcted for his doctrine in that kind; notwithstanding, your petitioner hath continued in prison ever since; which obstruction of justice your petitioner supposes to be made by the clandestine suggestions and procure-

ment of his antagonists, by reason whereof the detriment and losse of legal libertie, which doth not only redound to your distressed petitioner, but reflect upon your Honour.

Your poor suppliant being in prison, without hope of other help, presumeth so far upon your Honour's patient goodness, that your hon. House may be moved as your discretion shall direct, whereby he may either have a speedy trial, or that bayle may be taken until such time as the hon. House shall be pleased to appoint a determinate hearinge.

And your petitioner shall pray ever. By mee,

Paul Best.

To the Hon. William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker to the hon. House of Commons in Parliament at Westminster, these with his service present.

Endorsed—Paul Best, xxi Jan. 1647.

It appears from the Journals of the House of Commons that Best was released from his imprisonment, July 1, 1647.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A TRINITARIAN'S RELIGIOUS DEBTS TO UNITARIANISM.

Sir,

Will you allow me a page or two of your Magazine wherein to express my deep sympathy, as a Trinitarian, with the witness and the protest borne by the Unitarian church against that *spurious* Evangelicalism which pretends to the right of exclusive dominion over the Trinitarian churches? When I speak of Evangelicalism, I mean that theology represented by the "Record" newspaper,—not certainly the holy and simple "Evangelicalism" of men like John Wesley and Dr. Chalmers. I do not write this letter that I may have an opportunity of party denunciation; quiet and modest "witness to the truth" is what one should aim to render, and that alone. For mere denunciation is ever an unblessed thing, born of hatred and pharisaism.

Such witness, I think, Unitarianism has borne. To me, and to thousands more, your church has opened up one avenue toward the light out from among the black shadows of theological anathema and hatred. It helps one's thought to deliver itself from the cold and dark entanglements of dogmas whose strength lies in their threatenings, and to reach the presence of him whom we call the Saviour of the world. I owe in part to the spiritual power of some Unitarian writings of this age my deliverance from idolatry of the dead Christ of Bibliolatry; and greatly to it also my insight into that which Bibliolatry keeps entirely in the background, the humanity of Christ. Those writings will do much to give back to the church his name of "the Son of Man:" and to me, as I am sure to hundreds of other Trinitarians, their thoughts and aspirations never cease to mingle with the vision of Christ's sacred life, and to guide by his spirit of loving and forgiving humanity.—I hope this may not seem a forward manner of offering my single witness to the debt which pure and living Trinitarianism owes to the sister creed.

The Unitarian doctrine of Jesus Christ does seem *to me* most certainly defective,—heretical I dare not call it; for heresy is that which mingles the light of Christ with the darkness of party hatred, and must be charged quite as much against the so-called "orthodox," as against the so-called "heterodox" part of the spiritual world. If imperfection and one-sidedness of theological view be heresy, we are all heretics; and little children are *not* of the heavenly kingdom. But, for myself, I believe intensely and reverently that Jesus is the Son of God, who was with God from everlasting. And if one really believe *this* doctrine, how dare he cast a stone at any honest man as *a heretic?* for ought he not to remember that God has now visibly crowned humanity with his own divine glory, and that henceforth to him every true man is a new revelation of God's holiness and beauty? For me to believe, to trust that Jesus is the Eternal One, is to learn that man is no more bound by the darkness and littleness of "the flesh," but is transfigured with him to the likeness of those angels of humanity which "in heaven do always behold the face of his Father who is in heaven." Oh, awful hypocrisy, that any man can set himself above his brother-men because he has assumed the name of that Saviour of man who "is meek and lowly in heart." As I think of it, the only Trinitarian faith in the least worthy to be called "faith in the Son of God" and in his eternal Spirit, is a moral belief and trust that will breathe on the heart and around the life of the disciple, Christ's own love and forgiveness of man; that will transfigure the world to his vision, revealing to him that the true and the unselfish among men are become the children of a Heavenly Father and members of a family whose true home is in heaven—helping him to see the selfish and the untrue as in the light of God's boundless love and pity, and of a Saviour's holy tears—and teaching him to regard as his lasting enemies only the hateful and the devilish. Oh, if our Master were to come again and visibly walk in the midst of his churches, *who* would hear his "Woe to you," and who his "Blessed are ye"? Would the anathematizers of the late beloved Mr. Robertson be called to share his holy solitudes, and perchance their leader to lean upon his bosom? Would he *assert* in dogma his Deity, and refuse his blessed name to the meek and noble and true who deny it? Would he not, as of old, preach his name the Son of God, the way and the truth and the life to men because he doeth eternally and perfectly THE FATHER'S will? Would he who said he was "meek and lowly in heart," smile on those who think it *their* calling to tell to *every* man* in proud dogma his Deity, and to refuse his name (if *they* could do it) to all who deny the doctrine, however they may love and serve *him?* The meek alone, as of old, would he bless.

I believe that the Trinitarian church owes to its sister church a vast debt for the witness it has borne against *its own heresies of spurious orthodoxy*. For who are antichrist but they that deny the Father and the Son? And have not they so denied who loudly claim the name of Christ, and yet disbelieve that God *really* loves the whole world and will never change his love into damnatory hatred toward men, that he hates *only* the great enemy of man and all who blaspheme their holy humanity and become the children of that enemy? They may hold the dogma that

* "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ."

one whom they *call* Christ is God, but as yet they have not believed *in God*, for God is Love. They worship idols of creed; they have not yet seen, neither known, the loving, merciful Jesus. The Unitarian church has often preached the doctrine of the Son of Man against the doctrines of *arbitrary* damnation so often proclaimed *by antichrist* in the so-called "orthodox" church. Not that *I* dare to fix the name of antichrist on any one preacher or class of preachers. But it may be, for aught I know, that St. John would call those doctrines a blasphemy of the Beast. God be praised that one section of Christ's church has for long centuries borne a steadfast and (I suppose) almost an unanimous witness against the theological lie that He, our Father, will ever destroy any of his human children!

I shall ever hold it a sacred privilege that I may join in the worship of the Unitarian church, equally as in the worship of that church which keeps what I think the perfect creed. Among my most delightful recollections are those of some few Unitarian sermons, which seemed to me to breathe more of Christ's fire, and to incite more to Christian reflection, than any sermons I remember to have heard in these somewhat cold Scottish Calvinistic churches. And to join in the simple and solemn worship of the Unitarians,—so beautifully expressed in Mr. Martineau's Hymn-book,—is to me a blessed thing.

I have taken liberty to speak my thoughts and feelings with some seeming egotism, for I meant to sign myself only as

A Brother-christian.

Edinburgh, Sept. 12, 1860.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

Sir,

In reply to your correspondent *Fides*, I fear that my former communication on this subject was not so clearly stated as to be fully understood. And now, in briefly re-stating it in a different way, I shall venture to assume that he will admit that there is and can be but one infinite Being, and consequently that all other beings must be finite. This being admitted, it follows that the Infinite could not make a being equal to himself; that all created beings can have only finite and limited attributes, with the consequent liability to fall into error; and which liability, conjoined with the principle of self-love, naturally degenerates into what we mean by selfishness, which is the germ of all moral evil or sin against both God and man; i.e. against God, because it tends to violate the divine law as inscribed on the human conscience; and against man, because it tends to invade the rights of fellow-beings.

In reply to this hypothesis, *Fides* objects, that "this is simply to say that God was necessitated to make human nature impure and inclining to sin, so that the Omnipotent had to submit to necessity; which is a contradiction."

Here I join issue with him by denying that it is any contradiction; but, on the contrary, that as it is admitted that God could not make an

equal, and therefore, if He chose to create intelligent beings, they must necessarily be finite and fallible, it would be a contradiction to say that He could create otherwise; and therefore, as all created beings must be liable to error from the limited nature of their endowments, it follows that moral evil is the inevitable consequence of creation itself; for as God chose to create intelligent beings, and could not endow them with infinite attributes, He took on himself the consequences of the act of their creation.

Now I admit that to make God, in even the remotest way, the author of evil is very repugnant to our feelings; but when enlightened and far-seeing faith shews that God has made evil subservient to the production of good, just as medicine is in the hand of the skilful physician, and that apparently the good could not be produced without the agency of the evil in such a constituted being as man, the religious mind sees that evil is a necessary part of the Divine government, and founded in wisdom and goodness as well as in necessity; and that whilst the principle of sensation, developed into self-love, and that into selfishness, generates moral evil, it also serves as a check upon it by means of the pain and punishment, either felt or feared, consequent on the violation of the moral sense. And here we have perpetually "ill educing good."

I do not say that this hypothesis is free from all difficulty; but is there less difficulty in the opposite scheme? For is the *permission* of evil in an Infinite Being, having power to prevent its existence, a less difficulty than the direct agency of that power in compounding evil with the constitution of man as an inevitable condition of the general scheme of human creation? For surely, if God could have prevented the introduction of evil in the constitution of man, his goodness is compromised in not having done so; because in such case He is supposed to have had the power, but not the will to do so.

Is not the Divine foreknowledge the same in effect with the Divine ordination? for must not an event foreseen be fixed and certain? for how otherwise could it be foreseen?

It is childish as well as impious to suppose, as some have done, in order to avoid the force of this dilemma, that God's omnipotence drew a veil over his prescience when the germ of evil was introduced at creation; in other words, that God blindfolded himself on that occasion; and that He was afterwards surprised and displeased to find that evil existed, contrary to his foreknowledge or design; for assuredly whatever He did in forming man, He designed to do, and perfectly foresaw every possible effect of his work.

A theologian of some notoriety at one time in our body, Mr. Barker, seeing the puerility of thus setting one divine attribute at war with another, took the bolder and more consistent course of totally denying the Divine foreknowledge, in order to conserve the independency of man. Is *Fides* prepared to make that awful and impious denial also? I believe not, as he appears to have too religious a mind to do so. And what then is left him but to admit the supremacy of God's prescience and providence, even though the dignity of man should be somewhat lowered thereby?

What do we mean by the providence of God? Is it an empty, unmeaning sound? and does it signify that, so far from providing for the government of the moral universe, He has, on the contrary, abandoned

it to the wild chance and confusion of chaos? Do we not find that, through the working of cause and effect, "order is Heaven's first law"? And though that law is a "mighty maze, but not without a plan," too vast for human comprehension, yet if we may infer that the moral government of God is carried on by the opposing agencies of good and evil, and that a greater amount of good than evil results from the working of these opposite forces, the act of creation, although compounded with evil, both natural and moral, stands confessedly justified in point of goodness. And we are then enabled, with Milton, to say,

> "That to the height of this great argument,
> I may assert eternal providence,
> And justify the ways of God to man."

Kingsdown, Bristol. G. Pulleyn Hinton.

PETER AND CEPHAS.

Sir,

In your last No., after insertion of a letter from "The Writer on Peter and Paul, their alleged Differences," you say, "We have received from our correspondent Peter his *promised* Pauline History of Cephas." The latter, I presume, you mean to insert in some future No. It was *promised* in my first paper. I am of opinion, therefore, that the writer of the letter above mentioned has been hasty in supposing "that I have not one line of argument to offer in behalf of my theory." He might have reserved his rather unseemly criticism of my theory until he had before him *the whole* of my Life of Cephas, which, though he has overlooked it, was promised as containing full proof of my theory. He was hasty also in assuming that "I imply that Conybeare and Howson favour my theory by reading Cephas instead of Peter in Galatians ii. 9," for I assume no such thing. I have quoted their note so far as it brings before us the fact "that Cephas, not Peter, is the reading of the best MSS. throughout this Epistle, as well as throughout the Epistles to Corinth, except in one passage, Galat. ii. 7, 8." Upon the fact contained in this first portion of the note, I have built my theory, throwing aside the latter part of the note, because it is a conjecture which it was not my business to dispute.

Hoping the Unitarian body, to whom alone my theory is submitted for fair criticism, will wait patiently for the whole proof I have to give in its favour, and that you will kindly insert this letter in your next No., I remain, yours, &c., Peter.

Ayr, Sept. 11, 1860.

[The "Pauline History of Cephas" shall be inserted in a future No.—Ed. C.R.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

TRIBUTES TO THEODORE PARKER.

Lecture in the Birkenhead Unitarian Church, May 27. By Wm. Binns.
A Look at the Life of Theodore Parker: Indiana-Place Chapel, Boston, June 3. By James Freeman Clarke.
Sermon in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool, June 3. By S. A. Steinthal.
Lessons from the Life of Theodore Parker: Discourse in Hope-Street Church, Liverpool, June 10. By W. H. Channing.

It was not without fatal presentiment that we took occasion a few months ago, on Theodore Parker's retirement from public duty, to estimate his character, labours and writings, and review his autobiographical Letter to his Boston friends (C.R., March, 1860). We did so with ardent admiration of the anti-slavery man, with unfeigned reverence for the scholar, with more of honest dissent than sympathy towards the conclusions of the theologian, and a self-respecting protest against his bitter and contemptuous treatment of those who hold a miraculous Christianity. We have nothing to recall or regret in that estimate. We felt his sickness to be as gentle an admonition against harsh judgment as we should now his death. Those who have now, in the tributes above named, formed their estimate in the presence of death instead of sickness, have spoken in some instances more strongly than we, and have with one consent joined in the disapproving as well as the admiring part of our estimate. Parker himself on one occasion expressing his preference to the *verum* over the *bonum de mortuis*, added, "It is no merit to die. Why praise a man because he is dead?" "I will remember this honesty, brother, in speaking of thee," says Mr. Freeman Clarke.

Mr. Binns's Lecture, while not neglecting the discrimination which all carefully shew, is the most thoroughly *en rapport* (so to speak) with the spirit of Theodore Parker. He avows in the Lecture and quotes the avowal in the Preface: "My chief reason for speaking is gratitude for religious aid that I have received. In some of the darkest of my own experiences, his works mainly guided me into light and truth, and when a natural revulsion from orthodox theology had plunged me into unbelief, blessed me with a restored faith in God and the liberty of spiritual Christianity." We trace in Mr. Binns's style the infection, if not the imitation, of his master's, including some of its exaggerations and sins against good taste, as in his allusion to some doubtful Old-Testament miracles, and when he says: "We feel that the injustice of the Unitarians to him was the offspring of fear; his injustice to them was the offspring of love;" and describes one class of Unitarians as "men whose motto is, All possible truth has been attained by the past." He undiscriminatingly ranks Parker with "the Professors of our two Colleges," with Macnaught, Jowett, Baden Powell and Rowland Williams. Some of this group will not approve the classification. But he adds that he himself feels Mr. Parker's reasons for rejecting the New-Testament miracles insufficient. And he virtually rebukes the arrogant self-exaggeration of Parker, who thought that "he stood alone in maintaining the infinite perfection of God," which (Mr. Binns well says) "is but the original idea of Jesus of Nazareth, put forth in different words."

Mr. Clarke, who affirms the soundness of his Theology strictly so called, namely, "his doctrine of God," adds: "His Christology, or doctrine of Christ, I have thought defective, and his Anthropology, or doctrine of Man, somewhat defective too in important particulars." Mr. Steinthal and Mr. Channing point out also the one-sidedness and hardness of his theology. "It appeared to me (says the latter) to be defective in more respects than there is time even to note. From first to last, his system, so far as he had elaborated and expressed it, was mere Naturalism, and it never rose higher than a natural theology." Mr. Steinthal speaks as a true philosopher of the empire of natural law as not co-extensive with that of God. It was for saying essentially such things as these that the Unitarian ministers in America were branded by Parker and his friends as bigots and persecutors; and he, after repudiating as strongly as man could the special claims of Christianity as a miraculous revelation, and calling those who acknowledge such claims by every term of intellectual contempt, was *hurt* at being regarded by them as not a disciple of Christ. "The most unmanly thing," surely, that Parker did or experienced! His best friends are satisfied now to pass by his ideas of Christianity and do justice to his Theism; and even this they find not so *absolutely* certain, complete and admirable as his strong mind and will had represented it.

There is a singular diversity in the estimates formed by his two countrymen and friends, Clarke and Channing, of the work in which alone his theological opinions are methodized. Mr. Clarke says: "His *Discourse on Religion* in his first printed book remains his best one;" and thinks his rapidity of publication afterwards deteriorated him as an author. "He did not give himself time to go down as deeply as he might, and to meditate as fully as he might, before he printed." Mr. Channing, on the contrary, says: "His *Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*, by which he was first widely known, was the collection of a course of lectures, rapidly prepared, and delivered from week to week amidst the anxieties of his earliest controversy. And though he afterwards revised them and added references and notes, yet this book *should never be regarded*—what surely its author never himself designed it—as a *systematic statement of his mature opinions*." Certainly he published nothing else half so systematic, and never (so far as we know) repudiated or modified the *Absolute* system of religion there propounded. But Mr. Channing is partly right in pleading, as in explanation of the haste and immaturity of many of his too numerous writings (as confessed by Mr. Clarke), that "the Theologian had voluntarily made sacrifice of scholarly reputation, nay of dearly-prized studies, at the shrine of humanity. He longed to be a thinker and a writer; conscience commanded him to be an actor in Reform, and he obeyed. Honour to him for his generous deed! His life became his *Body of Divinity*."

All his friends and eulogists virtually accept it as such; and his zeal for human good, especially for the deliverance of the oppressed in his own country, will be Theodore Parker's immortality of pure renown, when his rash and crude theology is less read than at present. Yet, even here, one lover and friend after another is forced to regret "his bitterness," "his resentment," "his want of feeling or of taste, bordering upon irreverence," his "keenly satiric sketches of social customs and individual character," his "pungent criticism," his "too indignant

scorn," his "wild humour" "unleashing his swift wit like hounds on their prey." "Energetic and stubborn, he gave harder blows than he knew or meant." His "invectives—the most terrible which modern literature knows—against the kidnappers, the pro-slavery politicians, the pro-slavery priests and the slave-catching commissioners, were sometimes (says Mr. Clarke) cruel and severe,—in the spirit of Moses, David and John the Baptist, rather than in that of Christ. Such extreme severity, whether in Jew or Christian, defeats its own object; for it is felt to be excessive and unjust. I cannot approve of Theodore Parker's severity. I consider it false, because extravagant; unjust, because indiscriminate; unchristian, because relentless and unsympathizing." We cannot find scriptural authority, however, for Mr. Clarke's application of his text ("What went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment?"), as implying that John the Baptist was a man of Parker's faults. "I took for my text the saying of Jesus concerning John the Baptist; in which the Saviour *seems to excuse the harshness and rudeness* of his precursor, on the ground that such a work as he had to do required a man whose faults would lie in that direction. A civil and smooth-spoken gentleman, a man of decencies and proprieties, would not have drawn the multitudes into the wilderness to hear their sins denounced and their wickedness condemned. Nor would such an orator have gathered crowds into the Music Hall. Theodore was the John the Baptist of our day—the prophet of a transition state, when the law had ended, but the gospel only just begun. * * * And as Jesus apologized for John, and excused his harshness on the ground that such a character was required for such a work; so I doubt not that if our brother failed in the same way, it was for the same reason; and I think that our Master will make for him the same excuse." Most heartily we join in the conclusion, though we doubt the parallel.

The Edinburgh Review.

The No. opens with an article on the effects of the multiplication of Gold, founded of course on the treatise by the French economist, Michel Chevalier. The reviewer is captivated by the Frenchman's very extravagant estimate that there will be a fall in the value of gold of 50 per cent. The writers on the subject seem to us scarcely to give adequate importance to the extraordinary increase in the use of gold, in coin, in ornaments for the person and the house, which is taking place throughout the world. Had there not been, concurrently with the extension of commerce and domestic and international intercourse of the inhabitants of the world, the increased supply of the precious metal which is the standard of value, a revolution in prices would have been inevitable. Nothing is more wonderful or more calculated to strengthen our faith in Providence, than the way in which the Omnipotent Ruler *times* the discoveries and changes which effect economical and social revolutions.—The second article, on the Diaries and Correspondence of George Rose, is chiefly remarkable as affording another indication of the tendency which has set in among writers of various opinions, to put a higher estimate on the political conduct and aims of William Pitt the younger than formerly prevailed in liberal circles. Will the revelations to be made by the diaries and letters published half a century hence, raise the charac-

ters of our present race of statesmen? We fear not.—An article follows on the history of Lorraine and of its junction with France. Its special claim to interest is that it discloses, on the part of former French rulers, the policy of annexation and assimilation which, as recently developed by the fraudulent genius of the Emperor of the French, has awakened the anxious vigilance of Europe.—The next article, on the latest Geological Discoveries, has many things that will interest every intelligent reader. Speaking of Sir Roderick Murchison's last contributions to the science of geology, the reviewer remarks,—

"The succession of life from the lower to the higher forms of existence is the grand principle which he traces in all the geological records of nature; but in a very different sense from that which has recently been brought forward by Mr. Darwin. Sir R. Murchison finds in the great geological periods which he has described, the clearest evidence, not of an unbroken series of spontaneous development by a process of 'natural selection or otherwise,' but of distinct species, called successively into existence and adapted to the existing conditions of the globe."

The article which comes next has for its subject the Papal Government in its political rather than its religious character, and a damning statement of reckless crimes and follies does the history of the patrimony of St. Peter present. What the Bourbons, ever docile pupils of their spiritual head, have been in Spain and Naples, that the representative of St. Peter at Rome has been generation after generation and century upon century. The struggle between the Lombards and the Papal power is well described by the reviewer, and we extract a passage or two on this subject:

"Moreover, the popes were ardent advocates of the favourite and popular tenets of the Romans. The Romans were passionately Catholic, or anti-Arian; and in the great Arian controversy the Roman bishops shewed great devotion to the Catholic cause. . . . . But it was in their hostility to the Lombards that the popes shewed themselves the most complete representatives of the feelings of the Roman people. The Lombards were Arians; the Romans, as we have said, vehemently Catholic. The hatred between the two nations was intense. Liutprand, the bishop of Cremona, a Lombard, writes:

"'We despise so deeply the Roman name, that in our anger we know no greater insult for our enemy than to call him a Roman, for in this name alone we comprehend all that is ignoble, cowardly, luxurious, lying, and all the vices.' . . . .

"The Lombard kingdom existed for 206 years. The people shewed great aptitude for civilization. The Lombard code of laws is the best collection of Gothic laws in existence. This formidable nation were Arians; and besides being Arians, they maintained in Italy a separate and exclusive existence. Unlike Theodoric and his Ostrogoths, they never amalgamated with the inhabitants. The result must have been, in time, that the Roman name, all remains of Roman institutions, and the Roman Catholic religion itself, would have perished before them. Except the Exarchate and Rome, they already possessed the whole of Italy; and when, at last, they conquered the Exarchate, the Roman pontiff, Gregory III., was convulsed with terror. In vain he wrote the most suppliant letters to Constantinople. The emperor Constantine Copronymus was, however, willing that he should apply to Pepin, king of the Franks. Pepin descended twice into Italy; the second time, at the pressing solicitation of a letter indited by St. Peter himself, in which the apostle promised him all felicity, both in this world and the next, if he would free his church and tomb from the hated Lombards. The arms of Pepin were successful. The Exarchate was wrested from the Lombards, and the keys of its

cities were placed on the altar of St. Peter. Twenty years passed by. Again the Church felt the perilous neighbourhood of the Lombards, and again its chief implored the assistance of Charlemagne. The son of Pepin likewise descended into Italy, and with the exception of the great Lombard duchy of Benevento, the dreaded kingdom disappeared under the dominion of the Franks."

The sixth article is devoted to Dr. Vaughan's Revolutions in English History, in which, while the deserved censure is pronounced on the blunders which disfigure his narrative, justice is done to "the sound and practical character of his general views."—Then follows a pleasant, genial article on the Life of Ary Scheffer. In common with all that is exalted in principle or distinguished in science and art, Scheffer looked on the subjugation of France under its present iniquitous yoke with an intensity of sorrow and despair. As a painter, it is interesting to know that, as he advanced in life and in power as an artist, the religious element grew within him and increased in its sway over his thoughts. The reviewer quotes with approbation this passage from Mrs. Grote's interesting Memoir of the painter:

"The books of the Old Testament were perhaps those most frequently seen in his hand during the last eight years of his life. The study of pastoral, primitive, rude forms of society—with the touching episodes here and there occurring in the history of those early peoples—had an unfading attraction for Scheffer, whilst it served to prevent his mind and thoughts from brooding over the actual state of things in France. Still, it was from the New Testament that the larger number of his sacred compositions were taken; for he loved to dwell upon the humanizing influences and devotional feelings connected with the mission of Jesus Christ, whose ideal lineaments it was ever his loftiest ambition to portray."

The article on Serf Emancipation in Russia shews how a long course of wrongdoing makes it a matter of difficulty and danger to begin to do right. So it proved to us when we emancipated the West-Indian slaves; so also when we gave political power to the Roman Catholics of Ireland after a century or two of unjust exclusion and oppression.—An article on the recently published Correspondence of Alexander von Humboldt exposes with not undue severity the gross impropriety of the publication of cynical remarks, which not only painfully affect the living, but degrade the character of the distinguished man in professed reverence of whom they are given, without editorial suppression, to the world.—Of the three last articles, the only one which claims our notice is a too brief account of Cardinal Mai's impure and interpolated edition of the Vatican Codex. The article is rather historical than critical. We extract two passages; the first describes the relation of Erasmus to the Vatican Codex:

"The earliest public mention that we have of the Vatican MS. is in the controversies in which Erasmus was engaged soon after he published his Greek Testament. As his Latin version which stood by the side of the Greek differed in many particulars from the Vulgate, not only in phraseology, but also in reading, every opponent of the revival of letters, however innocent of all acquaintance with Greek, was able to make this Latin version the ground of complaint and invective. And especially was this the case in connection with the text 1 John v. 7, which had then for five or six centuries established for itself a place in the Latin Vulgate; but which Erasmus, following *Greek* authorities, omitted in his two earlier editions (1516 and 1519). For as to this passage, Erasmus had received some intimation that the Greek MS. in large letters in the Papal Library did not contain it; and in appealing to its

authority against its censors, he was fortified by an extract made in 1521, by Paulus Bombosius, the then Prefect of the Vatican Library; the extract shewed plainly that this Papal Codex agreed with Erasmus in the *omission*, if indeed it was an omission and not a *non-insertion*."

Of Mai's edition, this is the reviewer's judgment:

"There is nothing to raise a suspicion of intentional dishonesty, but the lack of care and want of judgment are manifest. The additions introduced from other MSS. to supply, not only the defects in the Vatican Codex produced through the injuries of time, but also the passages which this most ancient authority never did contain, exhibit a great want of judgment; and as to the execution, after all that had been done, there are pages which look like proof-sheets, examined by no one but a rather unintelligent compositor. Those who have compared Mai's edition with the previously existing collections, find that in several places the reading of the common text is retained through mere oversight."

The reviewer closes his article with an allusion to the MS. recently found at Mount Sinai by Professor Tischendorf, and now removed to St. Petersburg:

"This MS. in antiquity vies with the Vatican Codex; for this was an admitted fact before any part of it was known, except the portion of the Old Testament, which has been at Leipsic for the last sixteen years. Tischendorf states that the text of the New Testament in it is of the same class as that of the Vatican MS., but he gives no particulars. Its publication is, therefore, much to be wished; and it is probable that its indefatigable discoverer may himself bring out such a *fac-simile* edition, as shall be worthy of one of the most precious monuments of Biblical antiquity. But though we do not know the readings of Tischendorf's Codex, those who are acquainted with textual criticism can feel sure what their general character must be in a document of that age. We may well be impatient for further acquaintance with this MS.; and it is much to be hoped that some experienced collator may thoroughly examine the original, so that we shall not have to wait the length of time that publication of the text must necessarily take. Such a collation, so far from being detrimental, would be beneficial to the subsequent *fac-simile* edition."

POPULAR UNITARIAN TRACTS.

Home! Sweet Home! A Tract for Families. By John R. Beard, D.D. 10 pp.

A Common-sense View of the Bible. 8 pp.

A Break in the Clouds. By T. S. Arthur. 4 pp.

A Dream of the Blessed Ones who walk in White. By J. Page Hopps. 4 pp.

Brooke Herford's Tract Covers. Nos. 1—4.

The missionary agencies now happily at work in the Unitarian body render a supply of wholesome and popular tracts necessary, and it is satisfactory to find that in more quarters than one there is the desire and the ability to supply the want. The philanthropic and Christian warrior going forth to encounter error and sin must be supplied with the best arms. Happily there are in our midst men willing to do for our missionaries what Whitworth and Armstrong are doing for our soldiers by the application of modern science and practical skill in the manufacture of arms. Dr. Beard is an experienced manufacturer of these small arms, and we hope that his admirable tract will find a welcome in thousands of our cottages. It may whisper some valuable

secrets to fathers, mothers and children in other homes than those of the poor. "Home! sweet Home!" should be placed at once in every Tract Society's catalogue.—The other tracts named at the head of our page are the first fruits of Mr. Brooke Herford's spirited plan for issuing, under the general title of "Home Pages," popular moral and religious tracts. His purpose cannot be better explained than by himself in a portion of a circular letter just issued by him:

"I have commenced with September a monthly issue of 'Home Pages,'—short readable tracts, such as I feel (after fourteen years' experience in district visiting) will be popular and acceptable in the homes of the poor. They will be mostly in the narrative form: all religious, and some few distinctively Unitarian; but even these will be made interesting by incident and illustration. Each month, two, three or four tracts will be issued, to the amount of sixteen pages in all. I have also prepared a series of four Tract Covers, of two different sizes, so as to suit not only the 'Home Pages,' but tracts of larger size already in circulation."

The three specimens of "Home Pages" now issued are most excellent. They are varied in style and aim. The "Common-sense View of the Bible" will help both to dissipate orthodox prejudices against Unitarians and to teach correct ideas respecting the nature of the sacred volume. It has not by any means exhausted the subject, and will, we hope, be followed by other pages directed to the same end. "A Break in the Clouds" should be read by every husband who prizes domestic sunshine. Its four pages of simple narrative contain more good sense and right feeling than is to be found in many volumes of tracts of larger pretension. We hope Mr. Arthur will be a frequent contributor to Mr. Herford's Pages. Mr. Hopps's "Dream" is imaginative and poetical, but has a fine practical aim, and is thoroughly Christian in its teaching. The "Tract Covers" might, we think, be made with advantage a little thicker and stronger. The three pages of letter-press given with each could not be better. Why should not the economy of paper which is respected here be also attended to in the tracts? Two of the three tracts now issued have vacant spaces which might be advantageously occupied with lines from some of our religious poets, or with "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," on a topic congenial with the tract, from Channing, Ware, Hutton or Carpenter. We desire to tender to Mr. Brooke Herford our respectful gratitude for the zeal and judgment with which he is promoting missionary work. We look upon this work with no common interest. In addition to its direct blessings, it will, we hope, save our denomination from the habit of metaphysical dreaming, which is at present its greatest danger.

The Christian Examiner (Boston), Nos. CCXX. and CCXXI., *July* and *September*.

We have in this Unitarian periodical, which has long-established claims on our regard, a mixture of the scriptural and the transcendental views held by various eminent divines of our denomination in America. The editors will, we trust, keep the mystical subordinate to the more useful portion of their journal; and we will confess that we wish we could again have specimens of the fine practical and religious discourses, written in plain and intelligible English, such as adorned the Christian Examiner

some twenty years ago. The two Nos. now on our table are rather above than below the standard of merit of the Examiner. The July No. opens with a somewhat superficial article on the English language. The writer reviewed (Mr. Marsh) has discovered that Professor Newman has in his translation set Homer to the tune of "Yankee Doodle." Both Mr. Marsh and his reviewer join in a duet of self-gratulation when discussing the influence of America upon our common language. An article sufficiently learned follows on the conceptions of the Evil Spirit traceable in various systems of religion: it has the affected title, unintelligible to more than half who read it, of "Analogues of Satan." The remarks on the "Temporal Power of the Popes" are timely, strong, and we believe essentially true. Then follows, under the title of the "Broad Church," the discourse delivered before the ministerial conference by the President of the Unitarian Association. With much that is fanciful, there is some fine catholic sentiment in the discourse. The best article in the No. is that on John Calvin, which we would recommend, as fairly stating *both* sides of the case, to those of our readers who have been perplexed by Mr. Martineau's eloquent commendations of the religious dictator of Geneva. The reviewer gives this summary of Calvin's character:

"He was a man of godly sincerity; a very stern man; a man utterly regardless of what we call human rights; a most unlovely man in some respects, but not a man devoted to selfish aims, as appears from his honourable poverty and stainless purity of life; a man of great virtues and great faults,—faults which in part were the errors of the time, in part the excess of an austere nature and bodily disease, in part, too, springing from the frailties and passions of our common humanity; a great man, whose power for good or evil was larger than belongs to ordinary manhood, and whose signature was written with an iron hand upon his age."

Of the September No., which has just reached our hands, the most attractive articles seem to be, on "The Women of Thackeray" (vindicating, with only moderate success, that author from the charge of injustice to the better sex); on Dr. Huntington, the recent American *pervert* to orthodoxy; on St. Augustine; and on German Hymns. From the article on Dr. Huntington we learn that that capricious gentleman has just published an edition of Dr. Bickersteth's feeble "Rock of Ages," and has prefixed to it an introduction, in which he proves himself an adept already in some of the arts of intolerant misrepresentation from which Unitarians are wont to suffer at the hands of their orthodox brethren. We learn with some amusement that Dr. Huntington makes use of the modern theory, so much in vogue with some of our friends, of subjective spiritual knowledge as a bulwark of the doctrine of the Trinity. But what will our philosophical friends say to the rough handling which religious intuitions in this case receive?

"It is precisely what the Romanist says in defence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it is a very poor plea to offer. No such pretended subjective spiritual knowledge can have any weight as argument, nor can the pretence convey to a delicate mind any other idea than that of vulgar cant. That Dr. Huntington, or any other man, has a private interior witness of the Trinity, or of any doctrine, and that he feels this to be cheerful and comforting, is no reason why another person should receive it. He cannot offer the result of his experience in 'closets, and sanctuaries, and sacraments,' as a substitute for the 'dialectic process' which all who would be convinced have a right to

demand. His illumination may be good for himself, but it is good for nobody else; and the less that is said in argument about such witness from above, the better. It is intolerable arrogance for any one to claim that an inner acquaintance with this doctrine has given him superior capacity of understanding it as a proposition to the intellect, or of weighing its scriptural and rational proofs."

The reviewer brings into inconvenient proximity Dr. Huntington's present depreciatory estimate of Unitarians, their faith, their plans of action, preaching, &c., and antitrinitarian statements made and printed by him a very few years ago. Dr. Huntington's criticisms on the church he has recently abandoned are imprudently harsh. The reviewer well observes (p. 197),

"A man has the right to change his faith and to repudiate utterly all his former opinions, even after professions of matured confidence and eternal allegiance. But the statements of such a person concerning his former faith are to be very cautiously received, and to be taken with large allowance. No sudden convert is a reliable witness concerning the views he has abandoned. In proportion as his friendship was more ardent, his hostility is more bitter, and his rhetoric of defence becomes his rhetoric of attack."

In answer to Dr. Huntington's charge that Unitarians are declining in aggressive zeal and pecuniary liberality, the reviewer says,—and the remarks are partly true as respects England as well as America,—

"The last few years have shewn a wider propagation of their religious connection, and a larger increase in the direct agencies of their body, than any previous period of their history. More ministers, converts to their faith from the faith of the exclusive sects, have been welcomed into their body within the last twelve months, than in any year of the 'forty or fifty' which Dr. Huntington assigns as their term of age; and the vacancy which his retirement leaves has, in number at least, and perhaps in something more, been already fourfold filled. The special contributions in money have been steadily increasing, and if Dr. Huntington had taken the trouble to consult the reports of that Unitarian Association of which he was once an officer, he would see how much more liberal are the churches in caring for it than they were twenty years ago. The gifts of the single Unitarian Society in St. Louis within the last ten years exceed all the contributions of the Unitarian body in that period when Dr. Huntington would have us think it was so liberal and powerful. Antioch College alone is an answer to the charge that 'the confidence that gives money has abated.' It is indeed urged, that enough is not given, that we do not the half or a tithe of what we could do or ought to do; but this very importunity, this very urgency of lament, is a proof that enthusiasm is more living, and that there is quicker sensitiveness to religious needs. The same plea is pressed by the other religious bodies. Large and various as are the gifts of the Orthodox sects to specially religious causes, they are continually reminded that enough is not given. And if anywhere the lament be repeated, that there is lack of zeal in Church extension and of gifts in its behalf, it is in the journals of the Church of which Dr. Huntington has just become a member. The 'endless surprise' at the small amount of money donations is not peculiar to the Unitarian body; and gross injustice is done when this is cited as evidence of their 'failure.' Dr. Huntington has had too many personal proofs of the 'confidence that gives money,' to bring hastily a charge of waning generosity against the body he has left."

More calm and more consistent than Dr. Huntington must be the witness who will succeed in proving that Unitarianism is a "disastrous practical experiment."

INTELLIGENCE.

SOIREE TO REV. J. C. GANGOOLY.

The remark is sometimes made that the Unitarians of London do not possess the same warmth of feeling, the same energy and zeal in religious matters, the same desire to promote and foster missionary action, whether at home or abroad, that characterize their brethren of Liverpool, Manchester and other towns in the North. We do not believe this statement has ever been entirely borne out by fact. But if in years gone by it has been to a certain extent true, facts now directly contradict it. Recent meetings in London have been in every way as successful as those held in other parts of the country. We have just had an illustration of this. On Thursday evening, Sept. 13th, a soirée was held at Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars, to welcome Mr. Gangooly on his arrival in London. The time fixed for this his first appearance in the Metropolis was in several respects unfavourable to a large and influential meeting. It had been intended that Mr. Gangooly should spend two or three weeks in London; but indisposition and other circumstances induced him to alter his plans, and only a very short notice could be given of the meeting. It was also found that very many, both ministers and laymen, who would have been foremost in offering the right hand of fellowship to Mr. Gangooly, had taken advantage of the bright weather which had at length beamed upon us, and were scattered far and wide over the country. Under ordinary circumstances, such a meeting would have fallen under the charge of the London District Unitarian Society, but nearly all the gentlemen who so energetically conduct the operations of that Society were absent from the Metropolis. The Committee of the Unitarian Association, in anticipation of the arrival of Mr. Gangooly, had appointed a sub-committee to make arrangements for his reception and entertainment. By this sub-committee the soirée was organized, and the meeting took place under the authority of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Mr. J. E. Clennell, the sub-committee and the stewards, are entitled to commendation for their efficient conduct of the business entrusted to them. Notwithstanding all the drawbacks to which we have alluded, the soirée was a complete success. The room was crowded, many of the visitors being compelled to stand during the whole of the proceedings. The welcome accorded to Mr. Gangooly was of the warmest and most enthusiastic kind. The heart evidently went with the hand. None who heard the simple, natural eloquence in which Mr. Gangooly gave utterance to his thoughts, could doubt his thorough earnestness and sincerity, or have any fear lest the work he was about to undertake should not succeed, if success depended on his exertions. It was evident, indeed, that, as he himself said, God had put into that weak and slender frame a large amount of moral strength.—We now give a brief account of the proceedings of the meeting.

The chair was occupied by Rev. THOMAS MADGE, who thought this was an occasion peculiarly interesting to Unitarian Christians. After a short sketch of the circumstances which led to Mr. Gangooly's conversion to Unitarianism, he said he did not wonder that orthodox missionaries met with so little success among the Hindoos. Very different doctrines were needed to make way with them. Mr. Gangooly found it impossible to believe what those missionaries taught. He was nearly falling into simple Deism. In this crisis he met with Mr. Dall, and in Unitarianism he found that which his heart desired. But in openly avowing Christianity he had lost caste, and the loss of caste involved terrible consequences. This was proof enough of sincerity and earnestness. He (Mr. M.) was sure Mr. Gangooly would be received by the meeting with the warmest welcome, and would have their earnest prayers for the success of the arduous work in which he was shortly to engage. He concluded by offering him the right hand of fellowship.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT had much pleasure in moving a resolution of welcome to Mr. Gangooly. The present meeting bore a great resemblance to one held some months since in that room, when the subject of Indian Missions was discussed. He had said at that meeting that the work of conversion must be done by natives. When in India, he could not help contrasting the brightness of the country with the depression of the people. Everywhere there was oppression; everywhere the people had distrust of each other; everywhere there was a moral chaos. The present was a time of transition. The religious convictions of the natives had been undermined, without any other or better being given in their stead. Faith was everywhere diminishing; there would soon be nothing but atheism and disbelief. This was a state of things which called on every man to do

something towards altering it. The literature of the country was full of corruption, full of mischief, full of everything that is degrading. He drew this picture that Unitarians might strive to build up a pure faith. The history of Mr. Gangooly proved that orthodox doctrines would not satisfy his countrymen. Christianity presented in an orthodox form met with no response from him; in a Unitarian form it did. The teachings of the Vedantists were a failure. He hoped Mr. Gangooly would tell the Vedantists and Deists that he was nothing of an eclectic,—that Christ's teachings were commands, nothing less. He believed his friends would bring the natives and the Vedantists to a better knowledge of each other. The duty of Unitarians was to lay Christianity broad and deep, and help the natives in every way in their power. It must not be expected that Christianity in India would be a reproduction of Trinitarianism or Unitarianism as it is here; it would be an Indian Christianity. Success could only be obtained by a larger employment of native labour. Natives must teach the natives. Any influence Englishmen have made might be washed away in a few months. They cannot understand the natives—the natives cannot understand them. There was no progress so essential as religious progress. Laws were made that there might be perfect equality before the law; but they proved a failure; and they must be so without a vital religion, a religion that is a power. Native missionaries were the only men to produce such a religion. Mr. Pratt concluded a very able speech by moving the following resolution: "That this meeting offer to Joguth Chundra Gangooly a respectful and cordial welcome, and desire to express to him their satisfaction in greeting him as a Christian brother, and their earnest hope that to the last hour of his existence he may rejoice in having entered the Christian fold, and may find in the faith of Jesus Christ the truth which satisfies the intellect, the moral strength that regulates the life, and the spiritual influences that expand and elevate the soul."

Rev. J. Panton Ham, in seconding the resolution, had no intention of making a speech. He had little to add to what had been said by Mr. Hodgson Pratt, who had gained so much experience in India. He had had nothing of the kind. He would only say, in tendering Mr. Gangooly a cordial welcome, that he did it heartily, in the perfect conviction that he was thoroughly sincere. What he had gone through proved it. By accepting Christianity he had become an outcast. No higher proof of sincerity could be had than this. He (Mr. Ham) thought this the most interesting meeting he had attended since he became a Unitarian. Having himself been originally intended for an Indian missionary, he fully sympathized with much that had been said by the mover of the resolution. He thought many of those who went to India, in spite of their earnestness and sincerity, were very inefficient. No Englishman could have much success. The work must be done by men of the highest caste like Mr. Gangooly. We must begin with the highest caste and descend to the lower; for, as Mr. Gangooly had said, if water be poured on the head, it will cover the whole body. Unitarians might congratulate themselves in welcoming a Brahmin convert to their form of faith. No Christians but Unitarian Christians could do the work of converting India, and no Unitarian Christians but men like Mr. Gangooly.—The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Rev. W. Forster proposed the following resolution: "That our sincere and affectionate wishes will accompany Mr. Gangooly on his great mission; and that it is our earnest prayer to the Great Father of all that he may enjoy for many years the exalted pleasure of carrying to the minds and hearts of his countrymen the truths of an intelligent, benignant and practical religion." He was sure the resolution would have a response in every intellect and every heart present. All would wish that Mr. Gangooly's life might be spared for a long, long time, that he would be a burning and a shining light, and dispel some of the darkness that had been so long gathering in India. He had a difficult task to perform; and unless he had great faith in his God, in the truth of the doctrines he had to teach, and in humanity when properly understood, he would indeed find it a difficult task. He had to preach God as a Father, the God whom Jesus taught and imitated in his character and life. If he went with this testimony, he would succeed beyond his most sanguine hopes. A man going with views like these must produce a great and permanent influence in India. But he must not go merely with our wishes—mere wishes would not do; there must be works. We must do our utmost for the propagation of the views we hold. We must form a Missionary Society, to send out missionaries to India. There was not a congregation in England which would not do its part. It was sometimes said that charity should begin at home; but should it stay at home? If charity stayed at home, it would no longer be charity, but would be converted into selfishness. Mr. Forster concluded by

wishing that the Divine blessing may attend Mr. Gangooly.

Mr. Michael Andrews, of Belfast, seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Gangooly, who was loudly cheered on rising, said that he left India as an outcast; but the sympathy and kindness he had received from his friends alleviated the trials and the sufferings he had gone through, and a continuance of such feelings would alleviate those that were to come. He heartily reciprocated their kind feelings. From the fact of their assembling to welcome him as a convert, he perceived that they took an interest in the Indian Unitarian Mission. Mr. Pratt had spoken of the character of the natives, the Deists, the Vedantists, and the importance of native labour to convert the native. Since he left India, he had seen during his travels a great deal of the Christian life. Great was the contrast between it and the Hindoo religion. When he saw what the one was and what the other, he felt very sorry. If he had four mouths with which to speak, he could give but a poor sketch of the sad condition of India. There was no fear of his becoming like the Anglo-Indian missionaries. Though he had been two years in America, where everything was so different from that to which he had been accustomed, he remained, with respect to eating, drinking and dress, as much a Brahmin as ever. Eating and dressing did not make the Christian, but what a man believed and felt. He had adopted no English habits, therefore Christianity would not suffer through him in India. In reference to himself, he said he was a Brahmin by birth and profession; he had had high position. He used to look on the low caste with disrespect; but now that he had been taught by Christ, he felt so humble, that he saw no difference between himself and the lowest caste. He would honestly say, that he had been for two years a hypocrite in India, playing a double part. He had been a Brahmin outwardly, a Christian inwardly. Brahmins could not treat the low caste properly unless they got the spirit of humility from him who washed the feet of the low caste in Judea. English schools and colleges in India had done great things. Under the Brahmins, the people were ignorant; but the English government had opened their eyes, and now they see. Men even among the low caste study Shakspere and Milton. English preaching makes few converts; English literature many. No missionary he ever saw could convert him to Christianity; his missionary was he who learnt, not at Oxford or Cambridge, but of his Father. He was led to inquire what Christianity was; he had the opinion it was nothing but nonsense; but his anticipations were disappointed. He was at once struck with the sublime beauty of the words of the Divine Master. He wished to inquire further, but he had no books. There was a saying, that "Where there's a will, there's a way." That was quite true, and at length he obtained a New Testament in his native tongue. The Sermon on the Mount was a beautiful, sublime thing. He studied the life of Christ, and found it far better than that of Hindoo gods and goddesses. His definition of Christianity was, that he should feel for and love the low castes wherever they might be found. Humanity he thought the best book to tell us what are our relations towards men and towards God; for humanity is not totally depraved. The price he had given for Christianity was tremendously large, and he hoped God would make him prize it more and more. Being desirous to pray to our Father in a Christian way, he bought a Prayer-book; it was the Book of Common Prayer. He liked it well, but not the endings of the prayers. It was different from the New Testament. "God the Holy Ghost," "God the Son," was not the teaching of the New Testament. God is the Father, and Christ the Son—not God the Son. He read the Athanasian Creed, but that seemed to him a bundle of sublime inconsistencies. Then he went to the Deists, but he found they had no moral courage. He himself was not a fair specimen of the intelligence of the Hindoos, but God had given him a large amount of moral courage. If the Deistical Church numbered hundreds of thousands, the condition of India would not improve.—He would say a few words about the Indian Mission. We had little knowledge how much good that mission had done. He was pained when he sometimes heard disparaging remarks made of Mr. Dall; he always blamed those who made them. Mr. Dall was just the man for the Hindoos. Those who formed his congregation belonged to the highest class in the country; all were men of worth, intelligence and repute, and attended not from curiosity, but to hear what was good. Quality should be the test, not quantity. He had no doubt that in time a large congregation would be formed in Calcutta. It was our business to rear Unitarianism there. The welcome we had given him shewed that we liked the fruit of the Indian Mission; if we relished the fruit, we must take care of the tree. He did not wish to speak of himself, but he had left father, mother, all, for it. If we did but nourish that tree heartily and warmly, God would

bless us with other and much better fruit than himself.

Mr. Alfred Lawrence moved and Mr. J. E. Clennell seconded the following resolution: "That this meeting has heard with great pleasure the interesting statement of Mr. Gangooly, and trusts that the Christian Mission in India, carried on conjointly by the Unitarian Associations of Great Britain and America, may be the means, under Providence, of spreading abroad in that important country the belief in one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ."

On the motion of Mr. J. T. Preston, a vote of thanks was tendered to the ladies and gentlemen composing the choir of Mr. Forster's church, who had diversified the proceedings by singing a selection of part songs, thus adding greatly to the pleasure of the evening.

The meeting was not without its substantial results. Various subscriptions and donations towards the Indian Mission were announced; among them, the munificent annual subscription of £100 from "E. B."

On the following Sunday, interesting discourses were preached by Mr. Gangooly —in the morning at Kentish Town, in the evening at Essex Street. At each chapel the congregation was very large. The collections were, in the morning, £26. 12*s*. 6*d*.; in the evening, £40. 5*s*.

SWINTON, NEAR MANCHESTER.

On Wednesday evening, August 23rd, the members of the Unitarian congregation and friends from Manchester assembled in the school-room connected with the chapel, when upwards of 120 persons sat down to tea. This social gathering had been arranged with a view to the accomplishment of a double purpose. The Rev. C. C. Nutter, it is known, has for several weeks, and since his resignation of the Lincoln pulpit, been associated with the Rev. J. C. Street in active missionary labours, under the direction of the Manchester District Unitarian Association. The kindly feelings of the Swinton congregation induced them to create an opportunity for giving expression to their sentiments of personal regard and their appreciation of the services of the Rev. C. C. Nutter, more especially in connection with their own place of worship. But in addition to this, they had also another object in view, not less indicative of the Christian zeal and liberality which distinguish this interesting and promising society. Mr. Boardman, Jun., has for some years rendered most valuable aid in conducting the singing department of the religious services of the chapel. His important assistance at the organ and in the choir has been gratuitously and most cheerfully given. The congregation, therefore, have been anxious to evince their gratitude for his services, and also to express in a practical and tangible form their feelings of personal esteem and friendly regard.

An excellent repast, consisting of tea and other refreshments, most liberally provided under the superintendence of the ladies of the congregation, having been despatched, the chair was ably filled by Mr. Boardman, Sen. Having explained the objects of the meeting, the Chairman requested the Rev. J. C. Street to comply with the wishes of the congregation in giving to Mr. Nutter a cordial welcome, accompanied with the expression of an earnest desire for his prosperity and long continuance in the good work in which he was engaged amongst them. In a kind, generous and able manner, Mr. Street at once responded to the request, and in the course of his remarks alluded to the length of time he had been personally acquainted with his friend and coadjutor, even long before he had himself come into the Manchester district.—Mr. Nutter, in an appropriate address, full of interest and instruction, acknowledged with gratitude the honour conferred upon him and the kindly feelings evinced towards him on that and other occasions. —An anthem having been sung by the choir, Mr. Collyer next rose, and in a humorous but very effective manner commented upon various topics of local and congregational interest. His remarks, however, had more especial reference to the able services of Mr. Boardman, Jun., who had so cheerfully presided at the organ, and by his efforts in various ways had contributed to the welfare of the congregation. In the name of the congregation, accompanied with their audible and unanimous expressions of kind-hearted feeling and goodwill, Mr. Collyer proceeded to fulfil his pleasing duty of presenting to Mr. Boardman a handsome testimonial, consisting of a costly gold watch-guard and chain, on which was engraved the following inscription: "Presented to J. Boardman by the Swinton Unitarian Congregation, for his voluntary services in presiding at the Organ, 29th August, 1860."

Mr. Boardman, with evident emotion, expressed his sense of this mark of gratitude and esteem, and concluded a neat and appropriate address with the assurance that he should preserve to his dying hour the valuable memento of friendship and personal regard which he had just received from the hands of the Swinton congregation. A hymn was then sung; after which,

the Rev. J. C. Street delivered a very powerful and most instructive address on the progressive tendencies of the age in regard to the development of a free Christian theology. Messrs. Mitchell and M'Master followed with excellent speeches, and, had time permitted, other students of the Home Missionary College, who had come over from Manchester, would have addressed the meeting. The lateness of the hour, however, rendered it expedient that the meeting should now draw to a close. Thanks having been tendered to the ladies and to the Chairman, a hymn was sung, and the Rev. J. C. Street concluded the interesting and encouraging proceedings of the evening with prayer and benediction.

CHURCH OF THE DIVINE UNITY, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

This beautiful church, situated in New Bridge Street, forms one of the noblest material monuments of Unitarian faith and zeal of which the history of our denomination can boast; and the history of the congregation — the first Nonconformist congregation in Newcastle — includes among the occupants of its pulpit many eminent and faithful confessors. The names of the most recent of these, the venerable Turner and the devoted and apostolic Harris, will ever be held in high honour in this scene of their labours.

The congregation have just called to their pulpit, with unanimous voice, the Rev. William Newton, late of Hinckley, Leicestershire, where he had previously achieved singular success in reviving our almost extinct cause. He is a preacher of unwonted earnestness and fervour, yet wholly free from any of those extravagances which too frequently accompany these characteristics; and great hopes are entertained that his transference to a wider sphere of labour may prove highly advantageous to the cause of Christian truth and righteousness. Some of our readers may not be aware that Mr. Newton was educated at Stepney College for ministry among the Baptists; but having embraced Unitarian views, he has ministered for several years to the congregation at Hinckley with great acceptance and success.

Mr. Newton commenced his pastorate in Newcastle on Sunday, August 19; and on the following Sunday, August 26, the inauguration services were continued by the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, of Glasgow, who occupied the pulpit morning and evening. The church was well filled by attentive congregations on both occasions. On Monday evening, the 27th, the members and friends of the congregation held a public soirée in the school-rooms of the church for the purpose of manifesting recognition and welcome of the new pastor. The ladies had decorated the rooms with evergreens and paintings, and spread the tables with various interesting objects of art and vertu. At one end of the room, the word "Welcome" was formed in letters of bay-leaves; beneath which were the initials "W. N." A numerous and respectable company were present.

During the formal part of the proceedings, the chair was occupied (in the unavoidable absence of Dr. Hayle, who had consented to preside) by Mr. Joseph Clephan, who in a very appropriate speech sketched the past history of the congregation down to the death of the Rev. George Harris and the election of the new pastor. On behalf of the congregation, he bade Mr. Newton hearty welcome.

Rev. W. Newton replied in an earnest and feeling speech. He was glad for the sake of the congregation that he was a young man, for in that he had the prospect of some years of labour among them as their minister.

Rev. R. Spears, of Stockton, was the next speaker; and was followed by Rev. G. B. Porteous, minister of the New Church (Swedenborgian), Percy Street, who said he deeply sympathized with the Unitarians, because they had ever asserted man's capability for goodness and the divine life.

Rev. H. W. Crosskey also addressed the meeting. He hoped that the reciprocity of feeling which had now been established between the Unitarian congregations of Glasgow and Newcastle would be strengthened and consolidated.

Votes of thanks were passed to Mr. Crosskey for his services of the previous day, and to the Chairman. Singing and pianoforte-playing varied the proceedings of the evening, which were of a pleasing and hopeful character.

OBITUARY.

Aug. 29, at her house, Thorndale, near Belfast, ANNETTE, relict of the late Samuel BRUCE, Esq., of the same place, aged 62 years. This excellent lady afforded to all who knew her a pattern of the virtues which adorn and dignify private life. She had experience both of the sorrows and the joys of this world. Born and reared in affluence, she was, by reverse of fortune, required at one period to depend for her

support on the exercise of her talents and acquirements. United to a husband of principles and dispositions akin to her own, seldom, if ever, was wedded life happier than hers; but, fifteen years ago, he was taken from her in the very prime of life and usefulness. Nobly did her character abide each test! In her prosperity she was not unduly elated, and in her afflictions she was sustained by faith and hope; in every phase of her varied fortune she manifested the graces of a meek, benevolent and pious spirit, and realized the strength and comfort which it brings. In the latter years of her life, during which, her sons being now grown up, she enjoyed comparative leisure from the calls of domestic duty, she devoted much of her time and thoughts to two of the benevolent institutions of Belfast,—the Lying-in Hospital and the Female Industrial School; in both of which her regular and devoted attention to their concerns, her kind interest in the welfare of their inmates, her sound judgment, perfect impartiality and conciliatory kindness, both of feeling and manner, made her an invaluable fellow-labourer to those with whom she was associated in their management. Her gentle virtues endeared her in no ordinary degree to her family and personal friends, and, though displayed in a comparatively retired and sequestered walk of life, became the means of diffusing important blessings to a wider circle, and attracted the respect and gratitude of the community in which she lived. Sincere were the regrets with which her remains were committed to the last resting-place, but blessed are the hopes which console the sorrow that is felt for those who depart from this life with a heart and character such as hers.

Sept. 1, at his residence in Prince's Park, Liverpool, THOMAS HARVEY, Esq., who had long carried on in that town the profession of a solicitor, in which he had earned the highest respect for his talents and integrity. He was a member of the congregation worshiping formerly in Paradise Street, and now in Hope Street, and shewed through life the same warm attachment to liberal opinions, political and religious, for which his father in his day had acquired an honourable name, at a time when it was dangerous to appear as the friend of reform. His illness, which was of several months' duration, was borne with Christian patience and serenity.

Sept. 7, at Evesham, RONALD, second son of Mr. Anthony MARTIN, surgeon, aged 12 years.

Sept. 9, at Dorking, at the residence of her sister, Mrs. AGATE, aged 71 years.

Sept. 9, at the house of Rev. Brooke Herford, Sheffield, Miss JANE HOPKINSON, aged 28 years.

Sept. 13, at Fenton Barns, N.B., ISABELLA, daughter of Mr. HOPE, aged 3 years and 2 months.

Sept. 16, at Taunton, MARGARET, the beloved wife of the Rev. William Arthur JONES, in her 42nd year.

Sept. 17, at Dukinfield, in the 59th year of her age, ESTHER, wife of Mr. J. LEIGH.

Sept. 18, in the 64th year of her age, LUCY, daughter of the late William FINCH, and granddaughter of Dr. Joseph Priestley.

MARRIAGES.

July 10, at the Unitarian church, Adelaide, South Australia, by Rev. J. Crawford Woods, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM HENRY WILLIAMS, of Clare, South Australia, to ELIZA, second daughter of Mr. Jas. BRYAN, North Adelaide.

Aug. 30, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. P. W. Clayden, Mr. JOHN PALMER, of Lincoln, to PHŒBE, only daughter of the late Mr. William WALL, of Birmingham.

Sept. 14, at the Great Meeting, Coventry, by Rev. G. Heaviside, B.A., THOMAS SHERLOCK, of Birmingham, to CHARLOTTE BAKER, daughter of Mr. J. B. COMLEY, Coventry.

Sept. 17, at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, by Rev. D. Griffith, Mr. JAMES CREBER GREENFIELD, of Torquay, to FRANCES WARE, only daughter of Mr. John SNELL, of Tavistock.

Sept. 18, at Bridport, by Rev. J. Lettis Short, Mr. BENJAMIN TEMPLAR, of Manchester, to SARAH, second surviving daughter of the late Mr. J. SUTTILL, of Pymore, near Bridport.

Sept. 20, at Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Thomas Hincks, JAMES, second son of James KITSON, Esq., of Little Woodhouse, to EMILY CHRISTIANA, second daughter of Joseph CLIFF, Esq., of Western Flatts, Wortley.